

Roman Africa's Municipal Patrons

By

Peter I. Wilkins, B.A. Hons.

Department of Classics

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy,

University of Tasmania, October, 1989.

The thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other higher degree or graduate diploma in any tertiary institution, nor so far as I am aware, any material published or written by others, except where acknowledged in references.

Peter Wilkins
Peter Wilkins

Volume 1 of this dissertation commences with an examination of the epigraphic source material by which Africa's municipal patrons are mostly known. Municipal patrons are then discussed group by group (chapters II-VIII). These number four: group (A) (non-local administrators), group (B) (non-administrators of local or proximate origo), group (C) (administrators of local or proximate origo), group (D) (a small group conforming to none of the foregoing). Important provincial variations emerge for group (A) patrons, with those governing Numidia being routinely co-opted from the C2 on, while their counterparts in Africa Proconsularis (and the provinces later carved from it), whose co-optation was on a far more selective basis, are concentrated in the C1 and C4. Small communities rarely succeeded in co-opting group (A) administrators. Selectivity of group (B) patrons existed at all levels. Almost imperceptible for senators (other than women) it affected primarily municipal office holders and to a lesser degree equestrians (favouring those entered upon a career). For patrons beneath equestrian rank precedence was given to relatives of equestrians and senators, Carthaginian magistrates and collaterals, provincial priests and *curatores rei publicae*. Municipal dignitaries without these advantages are phased out by the early C2 in Africa Proconsularis to reappear infrequently in the C4.

Three chapters (IX - XI) discuss patrons of provinces and *curiae*, and *patroni incerti*. Patrons of Africa's provinces are unknown outside of Mauretania until the Dominate. The exclusion of acting governors dates to Caesar. All patrons of *curiae* are local men and of modest rank, where only one *curia* was client. Prosopography as well as analysis and comparison of epigraphic material (notably honorific dedications) provides a viable means for predicating 'non-patrons' and *patroni incerti* of varying potentiality. The final chapter (XII) examines the nature of the patronal contract and variations in the *quid pro quo* according to the status of both patron and client.

Volume II provides lists and tables to the text and alphabetical lists of the *personae* and *clientelae* involved. Lists of patrons with relevant details occupies volume III. The primary purpose of the thesis is to define the shifting criteria of eligibility to the

municipal patronate in Africa according to the status of patron and client, and to determine chronological and provincial variations.

Table of Contents

Volume I	Page
Foreword	1
Chapter I Inscription Types	8
Chapter II The Chronological and Provincial Distribution of Patrons in Group (A): The Lepcis Magna Factor	37
Chapter III Group (A) - Patronal Origins, Families and Estates	51
Chapter IV Group (A) Patrons - Numidia	65
Chapter V Group (A) Patrons - Africa Proconsularis	88
Chapter VI The Distribution and Status of Group (B) Patrons	106
Chapter VII Group (C) Patrons and Patronal Families (Groups (B) and (C))	160
Chapter VIII Group (D) Patrons	208
Chapter IX Patrons of Curiae	221
Chapter X Patrons of Provinces	231
Chapter XI The "Incerti". The Criteria used for their Inclusion	240
Chapter XII Beneficia et Merita	278
Conclusions	350
Bibliography	356
 Volume II	
Chapter I Lists A-D	387
Chapter II List A	405
Chapter IV Lists A-F	407
Chapter V List A	421
Chapter VI Lists A-G	422
Chapter VII Lists A-J	479

Chapter XI Lists A-E	516
Chapter XII Lists A-G	525
Alphabetical List of Municipal Patrons (Certi and Incerti), Patrons of Provinces and Curiae, Private Patrons and 'Non Patrons'	575
Distribution of Clientela	602

Volume III

Register of Africa's Municipal Patrons, Groups (A) - (D)	614
Register of Africa's Patroni Curiarum	670
Register of Africa's Patroni Provinciarum	672
Register of Africa's Patroni Incerti, Groups (A) - (D)	677
Register of African Personal Patrocinia	750
Register of Africa's 'Non Patrons'	782
Maps - Distribution of Municipal Clientela	797

Foreword

No complete survey of Roman Africa's municipal patrons has been attempted since the mid 1950's. In 1954 B. H. Warmington devoted a small article (17 pages) to the topic ('The Municipal Patrons of Roman North Africa', *PBSR*, IX (1954) pp.39-55). Over the next 3 years, two doctoral theses appeared which undertook to examine municipal patronage from a broader spectrum than that confined to North Africa. In 1955, F. Engesser endeavoured to survey all municipal patrons known for the western provinces under the Principate ('Der Stadtpatronat in Italien und den Westprovinzen des römischen Reiches bis Diocletian', Freiburg, 1955), whilst L. Harmand, with more ambition than success, attempted to embrace municipal patronage as it affected the entire Roman world, from the Republic to the end of the Empire ('Le patronat sur les collectivités publiques des origines au bas - empire - Un aspect social et politique du monde romaine', Paris, 1957). The article by B. H. Warmington - evidently published too late to be available to F. Engesser was as unknown to L. Harmand as the (unpublished) thesis of Engesser.

The theses of F. Engesser and L. Harmand do not attempt to discuss Africa's patrons in isolation from the other municipal patrons under survey. F. Engesser does, however, provide a catalogue of patrons classified according to their client's province, from which Africa's patrons (pp.55-104) may be easily disengaged. In the list of patrons compiled by L. Harmand (pp.188-284 and cf. pp. 538-548), extraction of Africa's patrons is made somewhat more difficult by the fact that other criteria take precedence over classification by province, but also by his long addenda et corrigenda. The patronal lists of all three authors cited are, regrettably, marred by serious errors and omissions, and obviously much recent information has since accrued¹. Besides the epigraphy relating to Africa's patrons from the volumes of *l'Année Epigraphique*

¹ For L. Harmand cf. the fusillade of cogent criticism directed at the author by E. Badian (Review of L. Harmand, 'Le patronat sur les collectivités publiques des origines au Bas - Empire', Paris, 1957, *Latomus* XVII (1958) pp.774-7). Whether Badian's concluding warning to others wishing to undertake the same topic, deflected a generation of scholars from doing so, is another question.

published since 1954 (the last volume cited by L. Harmand) several important corpora devoted to African epigraphy have emerged. These are 'Inscriptions latines de l'Algérie', II (1957 and 1976), 'Inscriptions^s antiques du Maroc', 2, inscriptions latines' (1982) and 'Catalogue des inscriptions latines païennes du musée du Bardo' (1986). In addition to many of the texts in these volumes, other African texts have appeared outside of 'l'Année Epigraphique' in the period 1954-88, in such journals as 'Libyca', 'Bulletin arché^ologique du comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques', 'Antiquités Africaines', 'Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire publiés par l'École Française de Rome', and in the three volumes of 'L'Africa romana' published to date. Finally attention must be drawn to the large body of unpublished African texts several of which concern patrons (cf. M.T.W. Arnheim, 'The Senatorial Aristocracy in the Later Roman Empire', Oxford, 1972, p.157, M. Corbier, 'Les familles clarissimes d'Afrique Proconsulaire (I^{er}-III^e siècle), Tituli, V, pp.689-91, 93-4, 713, 739-40, M. Leglay, 'Épigraphie et organisation des provinces africaines', Atti del terzo congresso int. di epig. greca e latina, Roma, 1959, p.236., C. Poinssot, 'M. Licinius Rufus, patronus pagi et civitatis Thuggensis', BACTH, n.s. V (1969) pp.230-1 n.8, 9, 10, 11, 14, p.233 n.8, 18, p.239, 242-3, n.10, p.254-55).

Valuable recent contributions to the study of Africa's patrons have been made by C. Poinssot (op. cit.), whose concern is with the patrons of Thugga, a town where documentation of municipal patronage is particularly rich; C. Lepelley ('Les cités de l'Afrique romaine au Bas-Empire,' I, 1979 and II, 1981, Paris) and J. U. Krause ('Das Spätantike Städt patronat, Chiron, XVII (1987) pp.1-80). The latter two authors take as their point of departure the late empire, C. Lepelley providing a masterful account of municipal life in the African provinces, J.-U. Krause an accurate overview of municipal patronage in Africa, Italy and the West. Among other contributors to the field of municipal patronage, particular mention must be made of the excellent discussion of Italy's municipal patrons for the Principate by R. Duthoy ('Le profil social des patrons municipaux en Italie sous le Haut-Empire', Anc. Soc., XIV (1983) pp.121-54, 'Scénarios de cooptation des patrons municipaux en Italie', Epig., XLVI

(1984) pp.23-48) and important articles on various aspects of municipal patronage again by R. Duthoy (e.g. 'Sens et fonction du patronat municipal durant le Principat,' *L'Ant. Class.*, LIII (1984) pp.145-56), but also by J. Nicols (e.g. 'Tabulae Patronatus. A Study of the Agreement between Patron and Client-Community', *ANRW*, XI, 13(1980) pp.535-56)². In addition, fundamental works surveying Roman Africa's municipal life have appeared in some number recently, of which it is only possible here to mention a few; J. Gasco, 'La politique municipale de Rome en Afrique du Nord I & II', *ANRW*, X, 2 (1982) pp.136-320; F. Jacques, 'Le privilège de liberté. Politique impériale et autonomie municipale dans les cités de l'Occident romain (161-224)', Roma, 1984; H. Jouffroy, 'La construction publique en Italie et dans l'Afrique romaine', Strasbourg, 1986; P. MacKendrick, 'The North African Stones Speak', London, 1980; R. Duncan-Jones, 'The Economy of the Roman Empire: Quantitative Studies', Cambridge, 1982 and J. M. Lassère 'Ubique Populus', Paris, 1977.

The first aim of this thesis is to establish as complete a base as is presently possible of primary information where patrons listed by group (see below) and province, appear in chronological order with their *cursus*, *origo*, client, date and reference. Cross references to related patrons or *patroni incerti* (see below) are provided, together with references to potential municipal clientela and to personal clientela. Indices to the final chapter list their *beneficia et merita* as recorded by the sources. These appear at the end of volume II, where all lists and tables to the chapters are given. The picture is completed by lists of patrons of provinces and *curiae*, patrons of private clients (personal *patrocinia*), 'non-patrons' and *patroni incerti*, all in the indices.

The patronate of Africa, as in other provinces, primarily divides itself into two categories. The first (group (A)), embraces patrons of non-local *origo*, whose patronate owed to an imperial posting in Africa; the second (group (B)), comprises eminent local citizens (or persons from the locale) who did not serve as African administrators. To this division (that adopted by L. Harmand) I have added two

² See bibliography for other articles by both authors.

others. Sufficient examples of overlap between groups (A) and (B) exist to warrant the creation of a third group (C), containing all patrons of verifiable local origin who either held imperial posts in the same province as their patria or who were immediate family members of persons who did. Finally, a fourth group (D), comprises primarily persons known only by lacunary inscriptions but also patrons neither of local origin nor administrative experience in Africa. The same division has been applied to *patroni incerti*, whilst attribution to groups (A) - (D) is indicated for 'non-patrons' and patrons of provinces and *curiae*, by assignation of the corresponding code letter.

After an initial chapter examining the sources (primarily epigraphic), for Roman Africa's municipal patrons, with particular attention to the evidence from *tabulae patronatus*, the thesis discusses each group in turn, then patrons of provinces, patrons of *curiae* and *patroni incerti*, before finally addressing the question of how reciprocal the benefits of patronage may have been, to what extent these differed according to the status of both patron and client, and why persons whose eminence and liberality suggest their desirability as patrons were apparently over-looked ('*Beneficia et Merita*').

The fundamental aim of the thesis is to define a patron, as far as is possible, by the criteria of their eligibility (including the hereditary factor) and to discover to what extent these may have differed according to chronology, province and the size and status of the client community. The nature of the sources is discussed for its bearing on this issue (a) to account for lacunae and distortion in patterns of co-optation and (b) to suggest from comparison of certain inscription types (notably honorific statue bases erected by the *ordo*) that a viable means exists for predicating 'non-patrons', and for supplementing our list of *patroni certi* with *patroni incerti* of varying potential as candidates.

Abbreviations

- (A) Besides the standard abbreviations employed for epigraphic references and classical journals, the following abbreviations should be noted.

- (1) C = Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum (vol. VIII).
- (2) C6, C14 etc. = Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum (Vol. VI, XIV, etc.).
- (3) D = H. Dessau, 'Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae', Berlin, 1893-1916.
- (4) Bardo = Z. Benzina Ben Abdallah, 'Catalogue des inscriptions latines païennes du musée du Bardo', Collection de L'École Française de Rome, 92, 1986.
- (5) Uchi = A. Merlin, L. Poinssot, 'Les inscriptions d'Uchi Maius', Paris 1908.

N.B. All references to PIR are to the most recent volumes available. Thus PIR, A-O are edition 2, PIR, P-Z, edition 1.

- (B) The thesis is heavily indebted to two recent volumes of Tituli, volumes IV and V, Roma, 1982, entitled 'Epigrafia e ordine senatorio'. References to these volumes in the patron lists appear as Tituli IV or V. In the text, references also include the author, but not the title. The titles may readily be obtained by reference to the 'sommario del volume' at the beginning of each volume.

- (C) All patrons (certi and incerti) and 'non-patrons' appear in the text with a code, letter and number for cross reference to the patronal lists in the second volume.

The code letters are:

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| A | = | group (A) patron |
| B | = | group (B) patron |
| C | = | group (C) patron |
| CB | = | patronus curiae/curiarum (all group (B)). |
| D | = | group (D) patron |
| IA | = | patronus incertus, group (A) |
| IB | = | patronus incertus, group (B) |

- IC = patronus incertus, group (C)
- ID = patronus incertus, group (D)
- IPC = patronus provinciae incertus, group (C)
- NA = 'non-patron', group (A)
- NB = 'non-patron', group (B)
- NC = 'non-patron', group (C)
- ND = 'non-patron', group (D)
- P = patron with private clientela (see 'Personal Patrocinia')
- PA = patronus provinciae/provinciarum (group (A))
- PB = patronus provinciae/provinciarum (group (B))
- PC = patronus provinciae/provinciarum (group (C))
- PD = patronus provinciae/provinciarum (group (D))

(D) In the list of municipal patrons (groups (A) - (D)) and patrons of curiae and province, volume II columns on the right-hand side headed, W,E,H. provide references (where given) to patrons as they appear in the patronal lists of -

- (1) B. H. Warmington (=W) 'The Municipal Patrons of Roman North Africa', PBSR, IX (1954) pp.39-55.
- (2) F. Engesser (=E) 'Der Stadtpatronat in Italien und den Westprovinzen des römischen Reiches bis Diocletian', Freiburg, 1955.
- (3) L. Harmand (=H) 'Le patronat sur les collectivités publiques des origines au bas - empire - Un aspect social et politique du monde romaine', Paris, 1957.

Note also that cross references to the recent work by J-U. Krause, 'Das Spätantike Städt patronat', Chiron, VII, 1987, 1-80 appear (where given) under the reference column, with the abbreviation, Krause.

(E) Regardless of attribution to groups (A), (B), (C) or (D), each entry in the main patron list is numbered first according to province, and then according to chronology. Thus all patrons numbered between 1 and 206 exercised patronage in Africa Proconsularis, between 207 and 266-7 in Numidia, and between 268 and 301 in Mauretania. The relationship to chronology is set out in the table below.

Century	Africa Proconsularis	Numidia	Mauretania
C1 BC - C1 AD	1-33	-	268-272a
C1 (dating approximate)	34-36	-	-
C2 (96-193)	37-67	207-234a	273-277
C1 - C2	68-69	-	278-281
C2 (dating approximate)	70-77	-	-
C3 (193-283)	78-123	235-252	283-290
C2 - C3	124-132	253-255	291-292
C3 (dating approximate)	133-155	-	293-298
C4 - C5 (post 283)	156-184-5	258-266-7	299-301
C3-C4	186-192	256-257A	-
C4-C5 (dating approximate)	193-205	-	-
?	206	-	-

Chapter I Inscription Types

With one exception from Latin literature, [Cor]nelius Romanianus, patron of Thagaste and its environs (B179-179a), all of Africa's municipal patrons are known to us only from epigraphy¹. The inscription types which refer to their patrocinium divide themselves broadly into six categories. Tabulae patronatus, the bronze plaques recording the actual conferment of patronage by a client community, may be conveniently treated as the first of these categories (A). The remaining five categories consist of - (B) Official dedications (usually, but not always, by imperial administrators and generals) of constructions or statues.

(C) Inscriptions on statue bases erected to a patron by the client community. These may be subdivided into those which (1) give no motivation for the statues erection, (2) mention some aspect of the patron's virtue, or state that the statue was erected 'ob merita', 'ob amorem' etc. or (3) mention a specific act of generosity on the part of the patron, or state that the statue was erected 'ob liberalitatem' or 'ob munificentiam'.

(D) Inscriptions on statue bases erected by persons unknown.

(E) Dedications erected by individual clients and dedications or epitaphs erected to (or by) a patron, by (or to) a family member.

(F) Dedicatory inscriptions recording a patron's benefaction, set up by himself, or by a member of his family.

Inevitably lacunae in some texts make classification impossible, and make for a seventh category (G) of uncertain inscription types. Finally, a very small group of inscriptions which do not conform to any of the above categories, requires a separate eighth category (H). References to patrons classified according to these eight epigraphic divisions are given in lists (C) and (D).

¹ c.f., however, Fronto, 'Ad Amicos' II for potential patrons of Cirta, and Claudian, de cons. Fl. Malli Theodori v.c. panegyriis 24 ff. (cited by Krause 170) for a probable patron of Africa Proconsularis.

(A) Tabulae Patronatus (i) Chronology

A relatively small body of texts, the bronze tabulae provide 25 examples of patrocinium, and concern 16 patrons and 19 towns (see list (A)). Almost half of the total number (12) were originally discovered outside of Africa, and represent copies which the patron would have had displayed in his domus. 11 of the 12 derive from Italy - 7 from Rome (A8, 164-164e), and 4 from Brixia (A9-9c) - and the remaining example (A301) comes from Corduba in Baetica. Even the tabulae found on African soil do not all tally with their findspots.

This is not surprising, when one considers that tabulae are small and easily portable, and that they found a ready market amongst European travellers and scholars. One plaque, for example, (D271), purchased by a Spaniard in 1821 at Bône (ancient Hippo Regius), derived according to its vendor, from near Cirta, but its origin must almost certainly be identical with the client community named on the plaque, Tubusuctu, as Dessau (D6103 adn.) has aptly noted, even though, at 170 km. by air from Cirta, the find spot can hardly be said to have been near it. Two other tabulae (A4,24) acquired by Camillo Borgia a little earlier (1815-17), refer to the town of Gurza, whose precise location is unknown. Borgia is known to have undertaken exploration in the region of Utica, and the tabulae may therefore have been found in situ, although purchase from a merchant is equally possible (cf. P. Romanelli, 'Le due tavole in bronzo di patronato di comunità africane conservate nel museo dell'Accademia,' *Annuario Accademia Etrusca di Cortona*, XVIII (1979) p. 48). Finally, a fourth tabula (B1) was reportedly discovered in Tunis, although the client community participating in the contract is not Carthage but Curubis, c60 km. by air to the south-east. There is reason to believe, that the patron was a citizen of Curubis, and possibly the brother of a contemporary freedman and duovir of Curubis, L. Pomponius Malcio, with whom he shares the same nomen. It is plausible, therefore, that the plaque was found in our Pomponius' Carthagianⁿⁱ domus, the patron having moved to Carthage to further his ambitions with Caesar's establishment of a colony there in 44BC, our text dating shortly before this date (48, 46 or - most probably - 45 BC). Alternatively, the text was not discovered,

but rather purchased, in the Tunisian capital from one of that city's ubiquitous merchants. The plaque was both 'discovered' and reported by a certain H.P. Ameilhan in 1789 (cf. C10525 adn.).

The provincial and chronological distribution of the *tabulae* display great disparity. Africa Proconsularis, as might be expected, is the source for the majority of the *tabulae* (15), yet only four of these were originally discovered in the province (B1, A4, 24, D37). One plaque alone (C266-7) refers to a client town from Numidia, and of the remaining nine from Mauretania, only three (D271, 291, A301) are from Caesariensis, all the others belonging to two Tingitanan towns, Banasa and Volubilis. (A272,272a,275,D279,280,281). Besides the *tabulae* themselves, there are three references to *tabulae* being erected in Africa Proconsularis during the fourth century (A183,B179-179a,199). If these are included in the total, the percentage of African *tabulae* deriving from Africa Proconsularis rises from 60% to 66.66% (i.e. from 3/5 to 2/3).

With one exception from Hadrumentum, of Trajanic date (D37), all of the *tabulae* from Africa Proconsularis are either of the first centuries (BC-AD), or the fourth (8 in the former and 6 in the latter). An extraordinary hiatus of 210 years exists, therefore, between the erection of a plaque to the anonymous patron of Hadrumentum in 112 (D37) and the co-optation of the clarissimus praeses of Byzacena, Q. Aradius Rufinus Valerius Proculus (signo) Populonium by six communities in 321-2 (A164-164e). The chronological pattern (if such it be) is all the more surprising, since it is diametrically opposed to the evidence of the vast corpus of inscriptions from Africa Proconsularis. Only a fraction of this epigraphic corpus dates to the first century, and this percentage expands progressively throughout the second century, to culminate in a flood of texts for the early third century. Tripolitana, excluded from discussion because of the disproportionately high number of first century texts from Lepcis Magna, is in fact, totally unrepresented by *tabulae* (a late fourth century state base (A183) does, however, mention that one of Lepcis Magna's 34 patrons was the recipient of a *tessera hospitalis*). The fourth century is well represented by the epigraphy of Proconsular

Africa, and proportionally well represented by the tabulae. This is so, despite the fact that all of the six fourth century tabulae from Africa Proconsularis refer to one individual, since corroborating evidence from St. Augustine (B179-179a), from the abovementioned text from Lepcis Magna, and from another fourth century text from Thubursicu Numidarum (B199) indicates that tabulae patronatus were regularly used in this period.

The over-representation of first century patrons of tabulae in relation to the insignificant proportion of first century texts from the corpus of Proconsular African epigraphy, can, however, be largely redressed if one considers that five of the first century tabulae from Africa Proconsularis were discovered not there, but in Rome and Brixia. As all of the six plaques recording the contract of patronage between Q. Aradius Rufinus and his clients in Byzacena in the early fourth century were also discovered outside of Africa (in Rome), we are left with only four tabulae patronatus for Africa Proconsularis found in African soil. These reduce themselves to three findspots, Tunis (B1) - 45 BC, the region of Utica? (A4,24) - 12BC and 65, and Hadrumetum (D37) - 112. If the total absence of tabulae for Africa Proconsularis for most of the second century, and all of the third century, provides an enigma, since these two centuries are so well-documented otherwise in Africa, one must bear in mind the very small number of tabulae actually found in Africa Proconsularis and be careful of drawing too many conclusions from four texts.

Before elaborating on this, let us examine the other two African provinces. Numidia has but one tabula and this dates to late in the fourth century (C266-7). Mauretania, where the epigraphic record is, in fact, otherwise much smaller than Numidia, provides nine tabulae, six from Tingitana and three from Caesariensis. All the texts from Tingitana concern two towns, Volubilis (A272a, D279) and Banasa (A272, 275, D280, 281). Two of the tabulae refer to the one person, and date to 75 (A272, 272a), another dates to 162 (A275), and the others are first or second century, antedating 162 (D279, 280, 281). The tabulae tally in every case with their findspots, and so can be compared chronologically with the corpus of Moroccan inscriptions, IAM. The

absence of fourth century *tabulae* is readily explicable by the absence of any epigraphic evidence for this period in Volubilis or Banasa, and the latter town was in fact destroyed in the late third century. The absence of third century *tabulae* is less easily accounted for, although it may be noted that in Banasa, where two thirds of our *tabulae* come from, there is a bias in imperially dated texts towards the second, rather than the third century. The Caesariensis *tabulae* are widely dispersed geographically and chronologically, and two of the findspots occur outside the province, one from near Cirta in Numidia (D271), and the other from Corduba in Baetica (A301). The first of these refers to Tubusuctu and dates to 55, while the other, where the client community was Tipasa, is the latest of all known African *tabulae*, and dates to the late fourth or early fifth century. Somewhere between these two belongs a *tabula* from Portus Magnus (missed by Nicols)², datable to the second or third century, prior to 268 (D291). As half of the 38 datable texts in CIL from Portus Magnus are all later than the second century, none can be shown to be earlier than 196, and seven are at least third century, we may possibly have our first third century African *tabula*.

However, even if the *tabula* from Portus Magnus be considered second, rather than third century in date, we do at least have a date high in the second century (162) from Mauretania, and evidence for fourth century *tabulae* from Mauretania and Numidia as well as Africa Proconsularis.

Nicols' contention, on the evidence of all the African *tabulae* prior to 250AD, is that their use for patronal contracts fell out of fashion in Africa Proconsularis 'at the end of the Julio-Claudian era', and 'began to be used in Mauretania at the very time that they disappeared in neighbouring Africa Proconsularis'³. Quite apart from the fact that the bronze plaque from Hadrumetum (not listed by Nicols) is over 40 years later than Nero's demise, and well after the two Mauretanian *tabulae* of 75, postponing the alleged disappearance of *tabulae* from Africa Proconsularis to at least the early second

² J. Nicols, 'Tabulae patronatus. A Study of the Agreement between Patron and Client Community', *ANRW* XI, 13 (1980), p.561.

³ *op. cit.*, p.540.

century, it is difficult to see why the practice of using *tabulae* should have fallen into abeyance at all in Africa Proconsularis.

Nicols' evidence for Italy and the non-African western provinces prior to AD250 shows that communities in Italy, Sardinia and *Tarraconensis* employed *tabulae patronatus* during the second and third centuries⁴. Although the evidence for the third century is still minimal, with only two *tabulae* known, they do date relatively high in the third century, 222 and 242⁵. If one had to posit any period for a suspension of use of *tabulae patronatus*, it would best fit the third century crisis, sometime between 242 and 321, when no *tabulae* are known for any western province. Although I am not offering this as a real scenario (patronal contracts were after all still carried out in Africa and elsewhere), it is certainly more plausible than a hiatus in the period when Proconsular Africa was experiencing a boom, and showing herself more and more eager to urbanise and adopt Roman laws and customs. Be that as it may, there is abundant evidence that Italy, like all the African provinces, employed *tabulae* as a normal means of documenting the patronal contract during the fourth century. While only three *tabulae* are known for Italy prior to 250 (in AD101, 107 and 242), eight can be documented for the fourth century, to which may be supplemented a fourth century reference to the employment of bronze *tabulae* in the co-optation of two brothers at Vettona (see list B). No fourth century *tabulae* at all are known for client-communities outside of Italy and the African provinces in the West, but this failure must be seen in a context, where fourth century epigraphy in general declines greatly in volume in these areas, and in particular, as it relates to patrons. Krause lists only seven patrons from provinces outside of Italy and Africa, two from Sicily, three from the Gauls, and one example each from Baetica and Dalmatia. None at all are recorded for *Tarraconensis*, whence derives the largest volume of extant *tabulae* (11) for the principate⁶. Whether

⁴ Second century - 101 and 107 (Italia), 158 (Sardinia), 185 (*Tarraconensis*).
Third century - 242 (Italia), 222 (*Tarraconensis*).
See list B for references.

⁵ See above.

⁶ The last known patron of a community from *Tarraconensis*, M. Caecilius Novatili[us]ianus, v.c., patron of Tarraco, dates to the latter half of the third century (C2.4113 = RIT,129). Perhaps of similar date are M.

or not the paucity of fourth century evidence for co-optation in the west, outside of Italy and Africa, is symptomatic of a decline in the practice at that time (a view to which I do not subscribe), it seems most probable, that where co-optation did occur, communities employed *tabulae* just as in contemporary Italy and Africa. The custom can, after all, be verified relatively late in two provinces, 222 in *Tarraconensis* and 158 in Sardinia (see list B).

In fourth century Italy and Africa, the evidence for the use of *tabulae patronatus*, is frequent enough to suggest that the practice was the norm. Taking into account not only the *tabulae* themselves, but references (epigraphic or literary) to *tabulae*, Italy records 7 client communities adopting the practice (Amiternum, vicus Foruli, Paestum, emporium Naunitanum, Cluvium, Genusia and Vettona) from four regions (III, IV, V and IX), and Africa over 12, all provinces being represented (see list A). We must, therefore, ask ourselves whether the fourth century saw a resurgence of a custom fallen into desuetude, as Nicols evidently prefers, or simply a continuation of a practice adopted from at least 45 BC in Africa, and from at least AD101 in Italy.

If we apply Nicols' theory to Africa Proconsularis, at what date must we posit a return to favour of the use of *tabulae*, after the last verifiable example in 112 at Hadrumetum (D37)? To have abandoned *tabulae* between 112 and 162 would make the province anomalous with neighbouring Sardinia, and Mauretania, where patrons are respectively known from *tabulae* in 158 and 162, as well as *Tarraconensis*, where *tabulae* can be dated a little either side of these parameters (98 and 185). Abandonment between 162 and 222 would still leave the province anomalous with *Tarraconensis*, where *tabulae* appear in 185 and 222. Africa Proconsularis would presumably have also been anomalous throughout this period with Italy, even though *tabulae* are only known for the principate in the years 101, 107 and 242. Despite a gap of 135 years between two of these *tabulae*, continuity must be preferred to the abandonment of a practice still followed for over 50 years of the interim by at least three provinces, and

Bombius Rusticus, v.e. (AE(1930)148=RIT156), and an anonymous praeses (C2.4134=RIT362) likewise patrons of Tarraco.

for virtually all of it by *Tarraconensis*. Moreover, such arguments *ex silentio*, might equally apply to another long lacuna in the Italian record of *tabulae*, that between 242 and 325, a period of 83 years, and what of *Thrace*, *Sardinia* and *Numidia*, where only one *tabula* for each is known, each from a different century?

Another explanation exists for the failure of any *tabulae* to emerge from *Africa Proconsularis* for the period 112-321, which avoids having to explain (a) why the province should be anomalous in this matter to others and (b) why the practice was both abandoned and later revived - questions, incidentally, to which Nicols offers no solution. The explanation is to be sought in the inherent likelihood of irregular transmission of objects in bronze, as can be gauged by the low survival rate of bronze inscriptions in general. Quite apart from losses due to natural disasters (especially fire), the value of the metal ensured that much of it would be melted down for coinage or for other purposes. Thus only 13 *tabulae* referring to African patrons found on African soil survive (another, IAM418, found in *Volubilis*, relates to a Spanish community), and only four of these from *Africa Proconsularis*⁷. What is noteworthy about these *tabulae* is that they parallel neither the general provincial distribution of African epigraphy, nor that of texts mentioning African patrons, where in both cases, the ranking in order of quantity of texts runs - *Africa Proconsularis*, *Numidia*, *Mauretania Caesariensis* and *Mauretania Tingitana*. The *tabulae* almost turn this order on its head. Restricting ourselves only to texts mentioning African patrons found on African soil, we find that *tabulae* represent only 8 out of 199 texts in *Africa Proconsularis* (or 4.02%), and a mere one out of 95 in *Numidia* (or 1.05%), whereas they represent two out of 26 in *Mauretania Caesariensis* (or 7.69%), and in *Mauretania Tingitana*, where^{nc} only 1/40 of African epigraphy derives, a massive six out of nine (or 66.66%). If the *tabulae* are so unrepresentative of the general pattern of provincial distribution, we should not be surprised if our small sample also exhibits quirks in

⁷ 13 *tabulae* - *Africa Proconsularis* (B1,A4,24,D37)
 Numidia (C266-7)
 Mauretania Caesariensis (D271, 291)
 “ *Tingitana* (A272,272a,275,D279,280,281).

chronology. Our evidence for Africa rests after all on just eight local sites, and covers a period of 412 years. Even when all the tabulae referring to Africa are considered, Tingitana and Numidia remain massively over and under represented respectively, and the total (25), still too insignificant a basis from which to detect a demise in their use from one province for one period.

To conclude, the high proportion of first century tabulae for the western provinces (25 out of a total of 37 tabulae dating before AD250)⁸ needs to be put into perspective with

(A) The general epigraphic pattern of the provinces (due allowance being made for the findspots of the inscriptions and the incidence of multiple patronage in Africa, where, for example, six of the first century tabulae involve just two patrons (A9-9c and 272-272a).

(B) The high ratio of fourth century tabulae from Italy and Africa, which compensate for the low numbers of third century tabulae, and indicate that their use was continuous.

(C) the small sample of tabulae in relation to other epigraphic sources, and the even smaller number of local findspots, due in large part to the intrinsic likelihood of bronze objects being destroyed.

Despite the statistical bias of the evidence, the view (Nicols p.541) that the use of tabulae patronatus tapered off sharply in frequency after the first century, lacks conviction, nor should we trust the silence of our sources to argue for a rupture in their continuity in Africa Proconsularis.

(ii) Patronal Status

It has been observed (p.9), that the 25 extant African tabulae refer to 16 patrons, and that additional epigraphic and literary references add the names of a further three. All patronal groups are represented, group (A) being most prevalent. The nine group (A)

⁸ Adding seven to Nicols total of 30

- (1) Hadrumentum (AD112) - ILA, 57 (37)
- (2) Volubilis (ante 162) - IAM, 488 (279)
- (3) Banasa (ante 162) - IAM, 129 (280)
- (4) Portus Magnus (C2 - C3) - C8.9767 (291)
- (5) ? (Baetica) (ante 73-4) - C5.5127
- (6) civitas Loug [-] eiorum (Tarracensis) (ADI) - AE (1984) 553
- (7) ? (Italia) - C10.5670.

patrons attested on tabulae present a wide spectrum of posts. Provincial governors dominate (two proconsules Africa^e (A4,8), two clarissimi praesides (A164-164e,301), a legate commanding the two Mauretaniae (A272-272a), a procurator in Mauretania Tingitana (A275), and a clarissimus vicar 'per Africanas provincias' (A183)), but there are also two minor officials, a tribunus militum (A9-9c) and a praefectus fabrum (A24), both serving in Africa under the Julio-Claudians. Chronologically, group (A) patrons represented by tabulae appear predominantly in the first century (six examples), and otherwise only in the fourth (three examples). Geographically they are restricted to Africa Proconsularis (six examples) and Mauretania (three examples), both provinces producing tabulae from the first and fourth centuries.

A high proportion of tabulae concern patrons classified as group (D). The classification, with one exception, results from the lacunary state of the tabulae. In three of these instances, the patron's name and offices are missing (D37,279,291); in another two the patron's name exists in full (D280) or in part (D281), but their offices are again lost. There are no means at all of indicating the patron's rôle vis-a-vis the client-community for the three anonymous patrons. For the remaining two patrons, whose offices are missing, senatorial status is clearly required for one, P. (Cornelius) Lentulus Sci[pio] (D280), who is either the same as the homonymous consul suffect of 24 (PIR, C1398), or a relative; and may be indicated by the nomen of the other, a certain L. Labienus [-], L. f. Pol. (D281), conceivably connected to T. Labienus (PIR, L19) an orator in the time of Claudius and a presumed descendant of Caesar's renowned legate. Both the latter are attested as patrons of Banasa in Mauretania Tingitana at an uncertain date prior to 162. A date in the early - mid C1 accords best with their names. Such a dating, and the rarity of attestation of senators as administrators in the province of Tingitana may indicate that Scipio and Labienus did not form their connection with Banasa as administrators. The Julio-Claudian era produces other senatorial patrons of African communities, whose co-optation owed nothing either to their capacity as administrators or to local origin. The connection with these patrons and their African clients, as perhaps for Scipio and Labienus,

appears to rest on their possession of praedia or other commercial interests there, or, perhaps, to the continuing loyalty of veterans settled there to a former commander. Personal interests of the former sort, are, on final analysis (see pp.213-16), the most probable solution to the vexed problem of the connection of Q. Iulius Secundus, legatus pro praetore (D271) with Tubusuctu in Mauretania Caesariensis⁹. Secundus is the only group (D) patron whose classification rests on the evidence of a non-lacunary tabula.

Only two of the six patrons documented by tabula, classified as group (D), appear on Nicols' list (op. cit., pp.560-1), viz. Labienus and Secundus (n.3 and 5 respectively). Both are taken by Nicols to be provincial administrators in Mauretania, with a query attached to Labienus (ibid., p.545). The assumption that Secundus was legate of Mauretania has the support of no other modern authority, and Nicols himself provides no explanation for this attribution. Moreover, the omission of 'Aug'. from Secundus' office of legatus pro praetore suggests that Secundus was legate of a proconsul, rather than provincial legate (see pp.214-15). Nicols' contention that all of Africa's patrons recorded on tabulae 'were demonstrably or probably imperial administrators' is premised on a belief that doubt attaches to only two individuals, Labienus (whom we have seen), and Africa's earliest documented patron, C. Pomponiu[s-] (B1). The attribution of an administrative post for the latter, is possible, as a lacuna in the tabula recording his co-optation deprives us of his offices, but there is considerable merit in the suggestion of Warmington (40 n.7), that the patron is a relative (brother?) of another Pomponius, also attested at Curubis at this date, L. Pomponius Malcio, the freedman and duovir who oversaw repair of the city's walls (C977). If so, we have a very early precedent for co-opting a local citizen by an African community, and for the employment of tabulae to this purpose.

The picture gained from analysis of Africa's tabulae within Nicols' time frame (the years prior to AD250) greatly expands the catalogue of doubtful administrators

⁹ The probable rejection of Secundus as Mauretanian administrator has further repercussions. Nicols (p.544) states that all senators on tabulae from the west, were with the exception of one woman, (Nummia Varia, C9.3429=D6110) 'patrons of communities which lay within their sundry administrative spheres'.

proposed by Nicols. From a list of 13 tabulae concerning 9 patrons, Nicols finds only two whose African administration cannot be verified, and these he regards as possible 'senatorial governors or legati' (p.545). In fact, the total of extant tabulae can be shown to be 17 not 13, of which only 10, concerning six patrons (A4,8,9-9c,24,272-272a,275) refer to verifiable administrators. There remain an even larger number of patrons known from African tabulae (7 from 7 tabulae, B1, D37,271,279,280,281,291) whose administration is questionable, and in two cases - that of Secundus and Pomponius - extremely so.

Looking beyond Nicols' time frame, it is abundantly clear that tabulae are still being employed for non-local administrators (eight examples, concerning three patrons - A164-164e, 183, 301). More interestingly, the distinction (if ever it existed in Africa, or elsewhere) between local citizens and non-local administrators, was certainly no longer in force by the fourth century. The use of tabulae in the co-optation of local Africans at this date can be averred for three patrons (B179-179a, 199, C266-7), and one, [Cor]nelius Romanianus (B179a), is explicitly stated by Augustine to have been recipient of tabulae from several neighbouring communities (*Contra Academicos* I, 2., cf. C. Lepelley, 'Les cités', II p. 179 n.23). A native of Thagaste, Romanianus appears to have occupied all the local magistracies and perhaps, like Aelius Iulianus (C266-7), the post of curator rei publicae (cf. C. Lepelley, *op. cit.*, p.180), a post, by this date virtually indistinguishable from municipal munera (cf. C. Lucas, 'Notes on the Curatores Rei Publicae of Roman Africa', *JRS*, XXX (1940) p.62 ff.). Aelius Iulianus is the only patron of Numidia known from a tabula, and the tabula is the only extant example for a patron whose African origins are incontestable (see above, however, for the probable example of C. Pomponiu[s-] (B1) some 412 years earlier). An inscription from Thubursicu Numidarum (ILAlgI1296) informs us that a third African citizen of the fourth century, [Na]vigius Egnatuleius [Po]mpeius, fl. pp. (B199), was also co-opted formally by tabula, a statue being erected in his honour 'post tabula[e] dationem'.

Not only were fourth century tabulae employed for administrators and local citizens alike, but the two groups were apparently not distinguished in any fundamental aspect by the format of the tabulae. Our evidence for this comes from the two extant fourth century tabulae from the western provinces, Mauretania Caesariensis and Numidia, where a new laconic formula had evolved, in which the ordo merely mentions that the tabula had been offered, adding a brief explanatory clause of the 'ob merita' type. The texts to the clarissimus governor at Tipasa, Fl. Hyginus (A301) and the local worthy Aelius Iulianus fl. pp., (curator rei publicae), presidalis (C266-7), bear a striking formulaic resemblance.

A301 (cf. C2.2110=D6116)

Fl. Hygino v.c., comiti et presidi p.M.C., ob merita iustitiae eius tabulam patronatus post decursam administrationem ordo Tipasensium optulit.

C266-7 (cf. D9510 = AE (1913) 25 = (1914) sub 188, sub 284)

coloni colonie Marchiane Traiane Thamugadiensis Elio Iuliano fl. pp., presidali ob reparationem civitatis ordo et populus tabula patronatus obtulerunt.

In fourth century Byzacena, all the extant tabulae refer to the one individual, Q. Aradius Rufinus Valerius Proculus (signo) Populonium the clarissimus praeses of the province (A164-164e). Four of the six tabulae are remarkably similar to one another, and retain the traditional format documented in Africa Proconsularis and Mauretania under the Principate. The two others (A164b,e) basically repeat the format, but drop the dual clauses relating to the concession and acceptance of hospitium (see below). There are no other fourth century tabulae extant from Byzacena or neighbouring Africa Proconsularis with which to compare these six to a single governor, but those known for this region from external evidence - the clarissimus vicar at Leptis Magna (A183) and the two local patrons, [Cor]nelius Romanianus at Thagaste and the vicinity (B179-179a), and [Na]vigius Egnatuleius [Po]mpeius at Thubursicu Numidarum (B199) - presumably also continued to stereotype the ancient formulae, without distinguishing between local citizens and non-local administrators. This assumption finds some support from the African tabulae datable to the principate. Thus, not only does the

plaque erected in 65 to a minor official (Q. Aufustus Macrinus, praefectus fabrum - A24) repeat almost verbatim the same format and formulae found on four tabulae to another minor official in 27-8 (C. Silius Aviola, tribunus militum - A9-9c), but it also corresponds almost exactly to an even earlier tabula (12 BC), erected by an identical community (Gurza) to a proconsul of Africa (L. Domitius Ahenobarbus - A3). The one tabula referring to a (probable) local patron (C. Pomponiu[s-], B1) is earlier still (45 BC), and it is perhaps this fact which accounts for certain stylistic differences with those discussed, although the format is basically the same.

The similarity in Africa of the tabulae considered above needs to be borne in mind, when we compare the situation with the Iberian provinces, Baetica and Tarraconensis, where the majority of tabulae refer not to administrators, but to persons of local importance. In Baetica, comparison of the plaques of a senatorial administrator and of a member of the local ruling classes (Nicols n.15 and 16), both datable to the early first century, reveal the same lack of distinguishing features that we have noticed in Africa for both foreign born and highly placed administrators, and administrators of local origin and unimposing rank. The tabulae, therefore, provide no internal evidence to suggest that a distinction was ever made between administrators and non-administrators. In Africa, where variations occur, they do so on a provincial or chronological basis (see pp.24-7) and in Tarraconensis, where a wide variety of formats is employed on their tabulae, the status of the patron is again irrelevant to their choice. If then, local African patrons holding no office in the province were accorded tabulae prior to the fourth century, there is no reason to think that they were marked out from imperial administrators by the general format of the tabulae themselves.

While the evidence for the existence of tabulae for local non-administrative patroni from Africa, is at best circumstantial, it has to be asked why Africa should differ from Baetica and Tarraconensis, where the practice was widespread. Nicols believes (p.545) that there is a 'clear distinction' between 'communities located in the area of the former Punic Empire (North Africa, Balearic Islands, Sardinia and Baetica) (who) all entered relationship with individuals who were demonstrably or probably imperial

administrators in their respective provinces', and 'the non-Punic interior of Tarraconensis', where 'the relationship is generally (in eight out of ten cases) concluded with men of local importance'. It must be stated from the outset, that Baetica, at least, can be excluded from the supposed Iberian or Punic traditions which 'may have influenced the manner in which the institution was practised' (ibid.), for in Baetica, two of the three examples are in fact local patrons (Nicols 14 and 16 - Nicols admits as much for one of them, n.16, on the same page). Baetica's exclusion disposes of the alleged Punic/Iberian influences which supposedly restricted *tabulae* to imperial administrators of the client's province, in areas which once formed part of the Punic Empire. The examples of Baetica and Tarraconensis can therefore be legitimately used to argue backwards from the fourth century, for the existence of *tabulae patronatus* for local patrons in Africa, despite the silence of our sources.

As with the omission of third century *tabulae* from Africa (bar one uncertain example, D291), we must once again decry the scantiness of our sources, which can only provide us with seven individuals whose status is known, prior to the fourth century¹⁰. The notion of the deliberate creation of two systems of co-optation under the Principate in Africa, whereby only administrators were entitled to the formal recognition of their patronate via *tabulae* is in accordance neither with contemporary Iberian practice, nor with that pursued in Africa in the fourth century. Besides the fact that for seven patrons recorded on *tabulae* from Africa during the Principate, the evidence for their rôle as administrator is either tenuous, or does not exist (see above), at least half of Africa's patrons (to judge from those documented) were local citizens, amongst whom an increasingly large proportion were of senatorial rank. Their exclusion from the same formal means of acknowledging co-optation as that accorded to administrators - even minor officials - seems tantamount to the creation of a second class category of patron, to which surely the likes of such powerful figures as C.

¹⁰ A4,8,9-9c,24,272-272a,275,D271. Scantiness of epigraphic sources - cf. J.-U. Krause (p.11 n.41). Commenting on Nicols' assertion that most *tabulae patronatus* in the Principate refer to administrators, and contrasting this with the situation in late antiquity, Krause likewise attributes these differences to the hazards of transmission.

Arrius Antoninus (B232) and M. Cornelius Fronto (B47) would not care to belong. That stratification existed among contemporary patrons of one community, can be shown by the album of Canusium, which places its senatorial patrons before those of equestrian rank (D6121). It may be doubted, however, whether the holding of an imperial office in a client's province was ever a criterion for distinguishing patrons of equal rank and position from one another. The position of the *ex consularis* Numidia, Vulcacius Rufinus (A265), as first on the list of patrons on the album of Timgad, is, for example, surely either due to the fact that, as *consularis*, he ranked above the other four (probably local) *clarissimi patrones*, for whom no such consular status is known, or - more probably - to precedence in his co-optation (presumably whilst *consularis*, over 20 years earlier).

The distinction on the album of Canusium was between senatorial and equestrian patrons, yet *tabulae*, as we have seen, could be held by senatorial and equestrian administrators in first century Africa, without distinction. I have difficulty with the idea that a small community might, for example, erect a bronze plaque to a simple prefect of the engineers (e.g. A24), yet deny a like honour to a local consul, solely on his failure to have occupied an administrative post in his native province.

(iii) Textual Formulae

(a) **Africa Proconsularis** Seven tabulae from the province are of the Julio-Claudian era (A4,8,9-9c,24). Although only two concern the same community (A4,24), the similarities in the form and formulae of the tabulae make it clear that a common model was universally drawn upon during this period. The tabulae in all cases commence with a statement by the community, continue with a statement of reciprocity by the patron, and end with the names of the legates who officiated in the contract. The contractual clause of the community almost invariably states that hospitium was concluded ('hospitium fecerunt'), and that the legate was co-opted ('patronum co-optaverunt') together with his children and descendants ('eumque posterosque eius sibi posterisque'). A tabula from Assuras (A8) is the sole variant from these stereotypes, the formula 'patronum co-optaverunt' being replaced with 'rogarunt uti in fidem clie[ntalemque reciperet]'. The patron, for his part, reciprocates in every instance by agreeing to accept the community into his clientela, and their descendants ('eos posterosque eorum in fidem clientelamque suam recepit'). Only one tabula (D37) is known from Africa Proconsularis for the period 65-321/2, and this is fragmentary. The tabula appears, however, to begin with a clause of co-optation by the community (Hadrumentum), and the formula 'hospi[tium fecit]', suggesting continuity in the wording of these contracts until at least the early second century (the date is 112).

The six fourth century examples from the province to the praeses Q. Aradius Valerius Proculus (signo) Populonium (A164-164e) retain the identical format of first century tabulae, as well as the general tenor of the formulae, although the intervening centuries have evidently (and inevitably) occasioned some divergence. The overall similarity argues for the continuance of the employment of tabulae in Africa Proconsularis, rather than a late revival (see above). A resurgence of the practice would also, one suspects, be marked by a greater uniformity of wording, whereas our six extant tabulae differ sufficiently from one another to be explicable by natural evolution. The most

divergent example, that from Thaenae (164d), for instance, derives from the community furthest removed geographically from the others.

The six tabulae co-opting Aradius commence with the contractual clause of the community, continue with that of Aradius, and (where complete) end with the names of the legati who participated, following faithfully the first century format. Five of the six communities also repeat the first century formula 'patronum co-optaverunt', Aradius duly giving the traditional response 'in fidem clientelamq. suam recepit'¹¹. In the exceptional tabula from Thaenae (A164d), these formulae are substituted by the phrase 'hospitium clientelamque fecissent' and the response 'hospitio clientelaque suscepisset'. The 'hospitium fecerunt' clause of the first century (of which these are a variant), is the formula least regularly applied on the tabulae to Aradius. In their use (or non-use) of the phrase (or rather of variants on it), the six tabulae appear to illustrate three evolutionary types. The phrase is either repeated in both parts of the contract (as opposed to only that of the community), as at Thaenae (A164d) and Mididi (A164c)¹², abandoned altogether, as at Hadrumetum (A164b) and Zama Regia (A164e); or retained, as in the first century, strictly for the community's clause, but in the variant form 'tesseram hospitalem cum eo fecerunt', as at municipium Chullitanum (A164) and civitas Faustianensis (A164a). The latter formula appears on only one other African tabula, our earliest example (45 BC) from Curubis (B1). This tabula shares some features of those so far examined from Africa Proconsularis, but its dissimilarities are such as to suggest an early prototype, restricted to a small geographical area and/or time frame. The divergences in the Curubis tabula include reversal of the position of the patron's and community's clauses, the appearance of the 'tesseram hospitiam fecit' formula in both clauses, and a brief laudation of the patron himself, 'eius studio benefici eis [- devincti publice] preivativimque'. It is possible that some of these variations ^{were} due to the much humbler status of the patron concerned (see above p.18 for his probable close connection to a local libertus and II vir), but the

¹¹ Those incomplete are A164 a,b,c. Legationes are clearly indicated in two of these, however, A164a - 'legationem prosecutus est [-]' and 164c - 'agente ordine [-]'.
¹² The example from Mididi employs the variant 'hospitium amicitiamque fecit'.

similarity of other African tabulae for patrons of widely differing status (see above p.21) renders this explanation unlikely.

In Mauretania Tingitana, the African province best represented after Africa Proconsularis by tabulae patronatus, only two communities are attested as clients, Banasa and Volubilis.

From Banasa, where the tabulae are most numerous (4), and in the best state of preservation, it is apparent that the tabulae follow the format employed by 12/13 tabulae from Africa Proconsularis. The three best preserved examples (A272, 275, D281) also indicate the use of the formulae 'patronus co-optaverunt'/'in fidem clientelamque suam recepit' as the norm, but the equally popular formula from Africa Proconsularis, 'hospitium/tesseractam hospitalem fecerunt', is absent. The two tabulae from Volubilis are badly marred by lacunae, but it is clear from one (A272a) that the dual contract form was in use. The patron is also known by a complete tabula from Banasa (A272), and it is probable that both tabulae parallel one another closely. In the absence of any complete tabula from Volubilis, however, and with the analogy of the variations of the tabulae to Aradius in mind, this can still only be speculation, and M. Euzennat's confident completion of the lacunae requires a caveat (AE (1969-70) 747 and IAM415).

The dual contract form was likewise employed in the single extant tabula (D271) from Mauretania Sitifensis, but the text shows some idiosyncracies. The position of the clauses of the patron and community are reversed (as in our early example from Curubis, B1), and it is the patron, rather than the community, who 'hospitium fecit', whilst the community rejoin with a variant of the formula normally applied to the patron 'eosque patrocínio suo tuendos recepit'. Only two tabulae are known from Mauretania Caesariensis, the example from the Principate (D291) being too fragmentary to indicate anything of its format, except that the contract - as in all cases so far cited - was officiated at by legati. The other tabula from Mauretania Caesariensis (A301) belongs both chronologically and in stylistic features with the one extant example from Numidia (C266-7). Both are late in date (late fourth - early

fifth century and AD 367 respectively), and except for their extreme concision, resemble tabulae from Italy and Thrace¹³, being copies of the ordo's decree of co-optation, rather than a record of the obligations of both contracting parties. The two tabulae, so similar to one another in wording, are akin to nothing else known from Africa, and are apparently a debased type unique to Africa's western provinces in the late Dominate¹⁴. Their significance has been discussed above in connection with the status of patrons co-opted (p.20)¹⁵.

The stylistic variations of African tabulae show marked variations according to provenance and to a lesser degree, as to the date of their manufacture. The dual-contract form appears to have been the preferred (possibly the only) African mode of formalising co-optation until the late Dominate, but within this format there are detectable 'provincial types' for the Principate, whilst in the early Dominate in Africa Proconsularis, the formulaic unison of Julio-Claudian tabulae has been abandoned for a greater latitude of expression, albeit within the parameters of recognisable types.

Remaining Inscription Types Recording Patrons

Comment on the inscription types other than tabulae patron^{ar}_{us} (Category A) which document municipal patrons in Africa can be brief, several important aspects relating to inscription types being discussed in some detail in further chapters. These aspects are (a) the relative rarity of some inscription types to record patronage (e.g. epitaphs and dedications by private clients); (b) the fact that some official inscription types (particularly dedications by administrators) mention or fail to mention patronage quite arbitrarily; (c) the conclusion that non-lacunary dedications by the ordo on which no reference is made to the honorand's patronage are the nearest guarantee we have that

¹³ See list (B) for references to tabulae from Italy and Thrace.

¹⁴ It is, however, possible that the type represented by the two tabulae from Mauretania and Numidia also appeared in Africa Proconsularis, where the latest known tabulae (to Aradius in 321-2) are 45-46 years earlier than the datable example from Numidia (367). Tabulae of the late fourth century Numidian/Mauretanian type may, therefore be conjectured to have made their first appearance in Africa Proconsularis at some time during this interval. None of the eight fourth century Italian tabulae which post-date 321-2, and which range in date from 325-395, however, approach the almost Laconian brevity of the Numidian/Mauretanian type, and Africa Proconsularis may also have opted for continuance of tradition.

¹⁵ Note also the classic distinction between the iustitia and liberalitas of the non-local and local officials.

the person concerned was not a patron¹⁶; (d) the difficulties associated with honorific dedications by the ordo which either give no motivation as to why they were erected or which conceal the patrons beneficia with abstractions¹⁷.

(B) Official dedications by patrons (60 patrons, 88 texts); cf. list (C) 2 and list (D).

The second largest of all inscription types to record patronage from Africa, category (B) comprises about 1/4 of all such inscriptions (88/344¹⁸ or 25.58%). All but seven patrons from eight texts in category (13) derive from group (A). More group (A) patrons are, in fact, known from category (B), than from any other category (53 from 80 texts, cf. the total from category (C) (viz. dedications by the ordo to a patron or a family member), 50 from 58 texts¹⁹. Although group (A) patrons are somewhat more numerous from Africa Proconsularis than Numidia in category (B) (27 cf. 23), they are represented by less than half as many texts (24 cf. 53). Moreover, while there is a large chronological gap for group (A) patrons from Africa Proconsularis known from category (B) texts, the years 136-7 - 326-31 producing only one extant inscription in which a group (A) patron acts as official dedicand (AD260-7 cf. A120-

¹⁶ See chapter IV p.74. For the omission of municipal patronage on dedications by the ordo to two individuals otherwise known to have been patrons, cf. p.238 and n.14.

¹⁷ See chapter XII pp.278-9, 291-3.

¹⁸ The total of all texts (344) is derived as follows:

Category	(A)	25 (list C (1))
	(B)	88 (list C (2))
	(C)	175 (list C(3-6))
	(D)	3 (list C(7-8))
	(E)	14 (list C(9-10))
	(F)	23 (list C(11-12))
	(G)	6 (list C(13))
	(H)	15 (list C(14-20))
	TOTAL=	349

This total of 349, must be diminished by 5 due to overlap.

Thus, the text to C168a (list C (5)) = that to B169, 170 (list C(11)).

the text to B17 (list C(2)) = that to B16, (list C(11)).

the text to B32 (list C(2)) = that to B13 (list C(11)).

the text to B134 (list C (3)) = that to B133 (list C(20)).

the text to C168 (list C(5)) = that to B167 (list C(20)).

The total is, therefore, 344. Note, however that this includes unpublished texts. Where more than one family member is so recorded, there naturally remains a likelihood that one text mentioned two or more patrons.

¹⁹ The total of patrons and texts for category (C) group (A) patrons is derived by adding the grand totals for group (A) patrons in list (C) n.3, 4 and 5. The total of patrons must be diminished by two, as two patrons appear twice (A226 and 234 in list C(3) and (4)). Similarly, the total of texts must be diminished by one, as A257 in list C (3) is known by the same text as A256 in list C (4).

122) - their counterparts in Numidia occur as dedicands with few interruptions throughout the C2 and C3 (see pp.91-2). The Mauretanian sample of group (A) dedicands is small (3 from 3 texts) with wide chronological variations (AD190, 247-9, 379-83). The residue of category (B) comprises 3 group (C) administrators (3 texts) and 4 group (B) patrons (5 texts). Those from group (C) are clearly acting in their official capacity rather than in their rôle as patrons. The rôle of the four group (B) patrons is less certain. Three derive from one community (Thugga - B17, 19-20, 32) and are all C1, the other, from Cillium, dates to the early C4 (B162). Two of the Thuggan patrons, L. Iulius Crassus (B17) and C. Artorius Bassus (B19-20), were also II viri of Carthage, and their action in dedicating the benefactions of other citizens perhaps owed to this function, rather than to their position as patron. Thugga was ascribed within the territory of Carthage (in pertica Carthaginiensium),²⁰ and another Carthaginian II vir, L. Manilius Bucco is found playing an identical part in Thugga at a similar date (cf. ILA558). The third Thuggan patron (C. Marius Perpetuus, B32), is recorded on a text only partially published, and apparently carried no other status indication than that of patron. As the benefaction was in this instance a bequest, it is possible that the donor, Q. Vinnicus Genialis, another patron (B31), was a family connection of Marius, whose rôle in acting as executor of the terms of the bequest sprang from personal, rather than official, obligations. Also curious is the late example from Cillium, which is worth citing in full - 'Clementia temporis et virtute divina dd. nn. Constantini et Licini invc. semp. Augg. (sic), ornamenta liberta(tis) restituta et vetera civitatis insignia, curante Ceionio Aproniano, c.v., patro(no) civitatis.' The text, which derives from the epistyle of an arch,²¹ does not clearly indicate who had ultimate financial responsibility for the restoration of the arch (the gift of an earlier benefactor), and generosity on the part of the patron may explain his intervention²². No such beneficence may be attributed to the 3 dedicating or

²⁰ cf. AE (1963) 94.

²¹ The arch is still extant, near a school in modern Kasserine.

²² Ceionius Apronianus is not, however, considered for inclusion amongst C. Lepelley's list of benefactors ('Les cités' I, pp.304 ff. and cf. pp. 287-8. On the insignia coloniae, cf. *ibid.*, p.287, 'les insignia coloniae

authorising group (C) patrons, despite their local origo - the texts are clear on this point²³ - and none need certainly be assumed for their group (A) counterparts, where some texts are more fragmentary.

(C) Statues by the Ordo to a Patron or Family Member (165 patrons, 175 texts); cf. list (C) 3-6 and list (D).

Just over one half of all inscriptions recording African patrons fall in category (C) (175/344 or 50.87%)²⁴. The overwhelming majority of these concern dedications to patrons rather than to family members (149 patrons from 157 texts, cf. 23 or more family members of 18 patrons from 23 texts)²⁵.

Families with two or more patrons might be honoured by the ordo with separate dedications (A256 and 257; B87 and 88; 91 (1 and 2) and 92; 188 and 189; C113 and 116)²⁶ or honoured jointly (B138, 139 and 140; 268 and 269; 149, 150, 151, 152 - cf. B132 and IB134A). Occasionally the honorand is described as 'patroni filius/a' (thrice for patrons - B97-8 cf. 96, 198 cf. 199 and C79 cf. 78; once for a 'non-patron'? - IB83 cf. B118), or 'patronus a parentibus' (B134 cf. 133, C168 cf. B167). More often, where a patron is defined by his relationship to another family member (normally a father, but occasionally children - cf. B107, 108, 137), that person is not described as patron²⁷, but this need carry no implication of non-

étaient, au témoignage du texte, figurés sur le monument: vraisemblablement les faisceaux, la chaise curule, les figures allégoriques de la libertas'.

²³ One refers to 'pecunia publica' (C178) and another indicates that a private benefactor assumed financial responsibility (C258). The third merely shows the patron authorising the establishment of *nundinae* (C243b).

²⁴ The total for category (C) texts is derived by adding all the bracketed totals in list (C) n.3-6 and diminishing the total by four, (four texts appear twice: A257 (list C (3)) = A256 (list C(4)); B92 (list C (6)) = B91(1) (list C(5)); B97-8 (list C (3)) = B96 (list C(4)); B188 (list C(4)) = B189 (list C(5))). Note that the total of patrons (derived by adding the unbracketed totals from list (C) n.3-6) is diminished by 3, as A226 and 234 appear in list C (3) and (4), and B102, in list C (3) is identical to the patron B240 in list C(5). This percentage is considerably down on that cited by R. Duthoy for Italy (almost 70%, based on 468 patrons for the period AD14-283) a fact primarily due to the large number of African texts involving official dedications by provincial administrators. (cf. R. Duthoy 'Quelques observations concernant la mention d'un patronat municipal dans les inscriptions', *L'Ant. Class.* 50 (1981) p.293).

²⁵ The figures, adjusted to allow for overlap (see n.24 above), are derived by adding the totals of list Cn.3 and n.5 and comparing the totals of list Cn.4 and n.6. 22 or more family members. Uncertainty accrues due to lacunae in three texts, where more than one family member may have been recipient (B75, 129, 130).

²⁶ At least two of these however, involved twin dedications (A256, B91). This is certain from the appearance of 'patronis' at the bottom of the dedications to Fabia V[ic]it[or]ia Iovina (A256) and to M. Munius Primus Optatianus (B91).

²⁷ Patrons so attested are B83, 87, 88, 91(2), 131, 141, 235, C63 (cf. B135).

patronage (cf. dedications to the father and brother of a patron of Thugga (B58) and others to the sons of a patron of Verecunda (A230), where the patron appears without mention of his patronate - see pp.71-2). On the other hand, family members of patrons whose own patronate is not attested, and who appear as the recipients of non-lacunary honorific dedications, are almost certainly not patrons themselves (at least at this juncture). Twelve individuals so honoured can be cited²⁸, 2/3 (8) from group (A), where the extension of patronage to family members has been considered improbable (see pp.52-4) and only 4 from group (B), of whom all but one (B118 - see p.187 ff.) are female²⁹. A further eleven or more family members of patrons reveal themselves as such on ten dedications. Five were themselves patrons (A257 (cf. 256), B91(1) (cf.92), B97-8 (cf. 96), B189 (cf. 188), C79 (cf. 78)), the remainder, all anonymous, are known only by acephalous texts and may possibly have been patrons themselves³⁰, although this is less likely to have been the case for three known to have been females³¹.

Statues to patrons, as to other eminent members of the community, were erected in such preferred locations as fora and theatres³². The recipients were, in the majority, persons of local or neighbouring origo, or at least residents in the client community. Thus, 74 patrons from 77 texts are from group (B), and represent almost half the number of all patrons so attested (74/149 or 49.66%) and almost the same proportion of texts (77/157 = 49.04%)³³. To these may be added a further 24 group (C) patrons from 24 texts, representing an additional 24/149 or 16.11% of the total of patrons and 24/157 or 15.29% of the total of texts³⁴. In all 97/149 or 65.1% of all statues erected

²⁸ A226a(3), 226b, 231(1-3), 234, 288, 290 (1-2), B51, 118, 148 (1-2). There are 13 texts, Numisia Celerina, wife of the legate A226 appearing twice.

²⁹ For the reduced eligibility of females as patrons, see p.251.

³⁰ B59, 75, 126, 129, 130.

³¹ Uxor (B59), mater et filia (B126).

³² Besides the numerous mentions of these findspots accompanying publication of the text, cf. IRT562(=A1769) and 566 (=A193) where the texts specifically state that the place of their erection was the forum Severianum, and the statue bases to two related patrons, the Pullaienii (B42, 55) still in situ in the theatre at Thugga. See also chapter II, *passim*.

³³ The total of group (B) patrons is derived by adding the unbracketed totals for group (B) in list (C) 3 and 5 and subtracting one (B102, list (C) n.3 = B240, list (C)5). The total of texts is had by adding the bracketed totals for group(B) in list (C) 3 and 5.

³⁴ The total of group (C) patrons and texts is derived by adding the totals for group (C) from list (C) 3 and 5 (unbracketed totals for patrons, bracketed for texts).

to municipal patrons by African ordines concern patrons of group (B) or (C), compared with only 46/149 or 30.87% of group (A) patrons³⁵. From this total of 97 group (B) and (C) patrons, the disparity of those relating to senators is high, 58/97 or 59.79%³⁶. This bias reflects (a) a preference for co-opting local senators over other members of the local aristocracy - as can most distinctly be seen by comparing this percentage with that for local senators not termed patrons on non-lacunary dedications by the ordo, 10/181 or 5.52%³⁷ and (b) the disproportionately high number of public dedications awarded to senators over any other status group. This may be illustrated by adding the totals of statue bases conferred upon local senators - patrons and 'non-patrons' alike (68) - and comparing this total ^{with} ~~to~~ the total of bases to all patrons and 'non-patrons' (279). The percentage of senators that results 24.37% is clearly a far higher majority of the local aristocracy than that actually represented by senators. Another approach, is to compare the percentage of all senatorial patrons known for Africa from honorific bases (58/79 = 73.42%) with those for other status groups. The percentage for the latter descends sharply in accordance with their position in the social hierarchy³⁸. R. Duthoy provides parallels from Italy³⁹.

(D) Inscriptions on statue bases to a patron or close family member erected by persons unknown (5 patrons, 3 texts); cf. list (C) 7-8 and list (D).

All 5 patrons are from group (B). They comprise the two Mauretanian kings Iuba and Ptolemy (B268, 269) honoured 'ob merita', another pair of patrons who were father

³⁵ The total of group (B) and (C) patrons honoured by statues is 97, not 98, as C63 = B80-1. There is also a very small number of group (D) patrons so honoured (6/149 = 4.03%). See list (C)3 and 5 for references to group (D).

³⁶ The total of texts concerning group (B) and (C) patrons attested by these dedications, 59, appears in brackets. See also list (D) this chapter. The remaining 39 dedications are shared between equestrians (18/97 or 18.56%) and those beneath this status (21/97 or 21.65%), with a small bias of some 3% favouring the latter.

³⁷ References appear in volume III 'Non-patrons'. The 10 local senators include 5 females (NC7, NB26-41).

³⁸ These percentages are: 'Equites Fonctionnels' (11/19 = 57.89%), 'Equites Honorifiques' (6/14 = 42.86%), 'Sub-equestrians' (11/26 = 42.31%), 'Others' (10/32 = 31.25%).

³⁹ op. cit., p.292 n.2. cf. J.-U. Krause, pp.10-11. The question of bias favouring senators is less relevant to Africa, where the percentage of local patrons attested by honorific bases is 50.87% cf. Italy's c70% (see n.24 above). 82% of Italian patrons of high equestrian rank are attested by honorific bases, comparable to the percentage of Italy's senatorial patrons. For Africa's career equestrians accorded the patronate, the percentage attested by statues falls substantially (over 15%) from that for senatorial patrons. Otherwise both Italy and Africa indicate that patrons of lower status were proportionately less likely to be attested by honorific statues.

and son, the senator [P. Iulius Geminius Marc]ia[nus] and his father [Ge]min[ius M]arcian[us] (B222, 223-4), and the consularis Sex. Caecilius Volusianus (B99). The ordines of Caesarea, Cirta and Thuburbo Minus are the most probable dedicands in every instance, attestation of municipal patronage by either private clients or family members being far less common (see below).

(E) Honorific dedications by private clients; epitaphs (15 patrons, 15 texts) cf. list (C) 9-10 and list (D).

With the exception of the curator Q. Gargilius Martialis and his homonymous son, patrons of Auzia, whose patronate is attested on the epitaph to Martialis senior (C285, 286) all patrons in category (E) are from group (B). Those honoured by private clients comprise two senators from Cirta (B219 and 232), one Mauretanian equestrian in the imperial civil service (B295) and a flamen from Thugga honoured by the conductores (B38(1)). These men form a mere fraction of the numbers of local eminent citizens known from dedications by their private clients (4/61 or 6.56%)⁴⁰.

As the majority of these persons belonged, naturally enough, to the very élite of municipal society, viz. senators and career equestrians, the group most courted by communities as patrons, there is a high probability that many were also patrons of communities. The title of municipal patron, as R. Duthoy has shown, appears, when indicated, outside the cursus proper of senators, and its mention on texts of a personal nature was, therefore, entirely optional⁴¹. This question is explored more fully in chapter XII.

The great bulk of African epitaphs concern persons below equestrian status, from whom one might anticipate the proud recording of the municipal patronate were it in fact possessed. It is, therefore, surprising to find that the epitaph to one patron, M. Calpurnius Faustinus of Thugga (B69), a local flamen of Thugga, recalls none of his offices or titles (C27369), and one can only assume that such displays of modesty post

⁴⁰ See the list 'Personal Patrocinia' in the third volume, (P29, 59, 62, 68-9, 71-2, 79-80, 92 and 98-151) and Chapter XII pp.332-5.

⁴¹ *op. cit.*, pp. 299-300. That the same is true of senators in Africa, and career equestrians, can be demonstrated from African epigraphy.

mortem were exceptional. Three other examples of patrons known as such but not so attested on epitaphs may also be cited. The senator C. Iulius Pudens, patron of Thibilis (B236), clearly considered mention of his patronage as irrelevant on an epitaph erected by him to his uncle (ILAlg II 4684), but not so his senatorial offices (quaes(tor) urb (anus), trib(unus) pleb(is)). In the case of M. Cincius Felix Iulianus (B46) whose epitaph states that he was *vir egregius* and held two Carthaginian magistracies (C27420), one may suspect that lesser posts and titles have been deliberately excluded (his patronage of Thugga would have been viewed as such). The remaining epitaph was erected by a patron, Q. Clodius Clodianus (B299) patron of Auzia, on the occasion of the death of his seven year old son (C9069). Clodianus has clearly abbreviated his *cursus*, since an altar dedicated by him (and his wife) in the same year (320) to Pluto, Cyria and Ceres Dis adds both Clodianus' patronate of Auzia and '*omnibus honoribus perfunctus*' (C9020 = B299(1))⁴². As both dedications date to within a year of one another it is possible that the altar given as a vow (*votum promissum*) was promised on the occasion of his son's death - the deities to whom the altar was dedicated would suit. Interestingly, what appears to be Clodianus' own epitaph does include the title *patronus coloniae* (C9068 = B299(2))⁴³. The dedicand who shares the same nomen is clearly either a near relative or freedman. The text is unfortunately mutilated.

From the four examples cited above it seems reasonable to conclude that where the detailed *cursus* of a person appears on an epitaph, but excludes the patronate, no assumption of non-co-optation is valid for individuals of equestrian status or higher, and this category might be broadened to include Carthaginian magistrates and provincial priests. Conversely, for mere decurions (or for that matter soldiers, of whom only one, the centurion and flamen Q. Ennius Eppillus (B33) is known as patron in Africa) such exclusion almost certainly should be taken to signify that no patronate was held. That only five patrons (B38(2), 100, 283, 299(2), C285) beneath

⁴² On both these texts and the problem relating to Clodianus' wife (who appears in both texts with the same cognomen, but different nomen) see C. Lepelley, '*Les Cités*' II p.536 and n.14.

⁴³ The text is missed by C. Lepelley.

equestrian status are recorded as such on epitaphs (erected by or to them) ought, therefore, to be regarded as additional testimony to the fact that concessions of patronage to Africans of the decurial class were uncommon, rather than to the unlikely probability that large numbers of municipal patrons from this milieu deliberately chose not to announce what in most cases must have been the pre-eminent dignity attained in their lifetime.

The failure of epitaphs to indicate the municipal patronage of senators, is particularly noticeable, the only example being to a *clarissimus puer*, M. Annaeus Maximus Aquila Fulvianus (B136) patron of Muzuc. The patronate's mention is explicable in these circumstances as being the only honour attained in the child's lifetime. For equestrians the information is fuller, and even includes prominent office holders (eg. Q. Iulius Maximus Demetrianus, procurator and praefectus vehiculorum, patron of Hr. Sidi Amar Djedidi B144-5). Six equestrian career patrons in all are so attested (B85, 144-5, 274 and 298 - all career equestrians - and two others, B187 and C286).

We may mention in passing the rather odd concentration of epitaphs relating to patrons from Mauretania, a province where evidence for patrons is otherwise slight (six are known - B274, 283, 298, 299(2), C285, 286, representing 6/34 or 17.65% of all Mauretanian patrons). On a personal note, the epitaphs illustrate that tragedy might blight the lives of even Africa's most well-to-do. To the short span allotted the *clarissimus puer* patron of Muzuc (B136) and to the inaptly named Felix, son of the patron of Auzia, Q. Clodius Clodianus (B299), may be added the heart felt testimony of another patron, Geminus Clemens (B298) who lost his wife and two children to the plague ('*pestis acerba*').

(F) Dedicatory inscriptions of a patron's benefaction or that of a family member (23 patrons, 23 texts); cf. list (C) 11-12 and list (D).

All benefactions so recorded by patrons, concern patrons of group (B), with the exception of the curator M. Annius Sacerdos, patron of Satafis (C297(1-2)) donor of *conchae* (basins), presumably in the local baths. The other benefactions range from altars (B299(1)), statues (B36,169,170), and cash bequests (B31), through to public

buildings of diverse cost and type (B, 7, 13, 16, 38(3-5), 39(3), 40(2-5), 41, 45, 46, 68, 90, 203, 284, 287, 296).

The implications of the poor representation among the donors of Africa's élite (only one senator (B90), and two career equestrians (B22(1,3),296) featuring on such texts) is discussed in chapter XII.

(G) Uncertain (lacunary) inscription types (6 patrons, 6 texts); cf. list (C) 13 and list (D).

Two of the patrons concerned are from group (B). The text to one, an anonymous II vir qq. from Sabratha, would seem to indicate his oversight or funding of the erection of a statue to the emperor Marcus (B62). The other apparently records the liberality of an anonymous patron of Auzia (B293), but it is unclear whether the dedication was erected to him or by him. The text reads '[...] cos et[...] a functus sua liberali patr. col.[...]o coloniae' (cf. C20749 adn. 'expectaveris liberalitate'). Description of the texts mentioning the other four patrons (all from group D) appears in chapter VIII.

(H) Miscellaneous epigraphic types (17 patrons, 15 texts); cf. list (C) 14-20 and list (D).

The six different headings under which patrons in this final category appear, are largely self explanatory (see list (C) 14-20) and require no additional remarks here. Discussion of some aspects of the album of Timgad appears in pp.54-6, 159, 321-2,3 43.

Chapter II The Chronological and Provincial Distribution of Patrons in Group (A) : The Lepcis Magna Factor

The provincial distribution of the 108 (133)¹ patrons of African communities from group (A) tallies approximately with the distribution of known African texts. Thus, the largest number derive from Africa Proconsularis - 62(73), the next from Numidia - 36(49) and the next and smallest from Mauretania - 10(11). The figure for Africa Proconsularis is, however, greatly inflated by a disproportionate influx of Tripolitanan patrons - 36(38), especially by those of Lepcis Magna - 29. Lepcis, therefore, provides almost half of the known patrons of group (A) from Africa Proconsularis (29/62). Sixteen of these are proconsuls of Africa, again approximately half the total of proconsular patrons from group (A) (16/33). Nearly 2/5 of all known examples of patrociniū for group (A) patrons as a whole, in Africa Proconsularis, are from Lepcis (29/73)². To counter the distortionate effect of Lepcis' numerical over-representation, in the following charts, (except A), the figures for Lepcis have been allocated a separate column, and two columns for Africa Proconsularis are given, one including, the other excluding the Lepcis figures. There is likewise an additional column for the grand total subtracting the Lepcis figures. The distortion from Lepcis

¹ Throughout this chapter all numbers in brackets, indicate the figure for patrociniū

² 16 proconsular patrons of Lepcis Magna:

C1	A5,6,10,11,14,21,23,25,26,27a,30,34,35
C2	A49
C4	A156,180

19 proconsular patrons outside of Lepcis Magna:

C1	A4,8,14a,18,27,29
C2	A43,44,50,52,60,61,67
C3	A89A,120
C4	A163,175,177,201

(2 patrons, A14-14a and 27-27a, were patrons both of Lepcis Magna and Hippo Regius. The total of proconsular patrons is, therefore, 33 not 35).

13 remaining group (A) patrons of Lepcis Magna:

C1	A12,28
C4	A158,159,176a,181,182,183,193,194,195,196,204

19 remaining group (A) patrons outside of Lepcis Magna

C1	A3,9-9c,15,24
C2	A53,54
C3	A109, 119, 121, 122
C4	A164-164e,165,166,171,172,173,176,182a,198

(1 patron, 182-182a, was patron both of Lepcis Magna and Sabratha. Two other patrons had multiple clientela, 9-9c, 164-164e. The total of patrons is, therefore, 31 not 40).

Magna is not only numerical, but chronological, all of those from group (A) being, with one exception (A49, dating to 153-4), confined to either extreme of the chronological spectrum, 15 being of the first century and 12 dating from the end of the third century to the beginning of the fifth.

This erratic distribution of patrons from Lepcis affects in particular the overwhelming majority who belong to group (A) - 29/34. The second century is, however, also poorly represented by the five patrons not from group (A);³ with only one possible entry from group D (D71). The other four all date to the third or fourth century, and are local citizens from groups (B) and (C). The absence of any first century examples from these groups is not unusual in Africa, and presents no problem. The very poor showing of all second and third century (pre -Diocletian) patrons from Lepcis - only four known from a total of 34⁴ (two for each century) - does require comment. We can quickly discount any notion that the co-optation of patrons by the Lepcitanes was almost completely arrested for two centuries. Nine of the 13 known patrons from other Tripolitanan towns (Sabratha, Oea, Gigthis) date between 138 and 260, and more precisely, in all but one case (B127), between 159 and 235⁵, an optimum period of civic prosperity throughout Africa, and no less so for Lepcis, particularly of course under the Severans. It is, therefore, unthinkable that at this time, Tripolitana's principal city should become anomalous with other towns in the region.

The texts which should fill this gap have evidently been either destroyed through time, or remain to be excavated. In the introduction to the Lepcis texts in IRT (p.77), the editors comment that 'The second century is perhaps less adequately represented by the remains so far uncovered : if there was anything at Lepcis to correspond to the

³ Five patrons of Lepcis Magna from groups B, C and D:

C2 D71
C3 B108,135
C4 C157,174

⁴ C2 A49,D71
C3 B108,135

⁵ 9 C2 - C3 patrons of Tripolitanan towns other than Lepcis Magna:

Gigthis - A52,53,54(159-60), B103,104(C211-17), B127(138-260); Oea - C84(193-215); Sabratha - A109 (c222-35), B62 (175-80).

The four other patrons from these communities are C4;

Gigthis - A176 (355-61); Sabratha - A165 (324-6), A182a (378), A198 (C4).

Antonine expansion of Sabratha, it lay outside the limits of the present excavations (e.g. the, as yet undiscovered, Ulpia basilica cum foro eius, 543). Mme. Ginette di Vita Evrard has also mentioned to me that the probable (unexcavated) site of the mid-second century temple of Apollo (cf. IRT707 =PBSR, 23 (1955) 132-3, and an unpublished text) has unlocked potential of a high magnitude. There is then, some basis for hope, that future excavations will help to remedy the current paucity of information on second and third century patrons.

(A) Distribution of Texts from the Two Fora and the Theatre.⁶

Sites in Lepcis	Texts datable to a reign					Texts mentioning patrons				
	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	Total
Magna										
forum vetus	20	12	29	4	65	3(2)	-	-	1	4(3)
forum	-	2	13	24	39	-	1?(-)	2(-)	13(9)	16(9)
Severianum										
theatre	8	13	27	1	49	1	-	-	-	1(1)
	28	27	69	29	153	4(3)	1?(-)	2(-)	14(9)	21(13)

From the chart above, it can be seen that of the three sites where the majority of texts (datable to within an imperial reign) derive, only one, the forum Severianum, attests any second or third century patrons (D71,B108,135), none of whom are from group (A). As fora and theatres were among the most preferred locations in which to erect honorific dedications to patrons (cf. those at the forum in Gigthis for the second and third century, A52-4,B103-4,127), the disappointing survival rate of second-third century texts referring to patrons from these sites in Lepcis, probably indicates that an extremely high proportion of honorific dedications to patrons at Lepcis for this period has been lost permanently. None at all survive from the forum vetus or theatre before

⁶ Numbers in brackets give the figure for texts datable to a reign.

the fourth century (there is one fourth century example in the forum vetus)⁷, and the three second and third century dedications from the forum Severianum represent 3/4 of all known patrons of Lepcis for this period⁸. The survival of so many fourth century honorific bases to patrons in this last site, may indicate that here, at least, many of the earlier dedications had been destroyed, re-used or transferred even during this century. This is borne out by the total figures for the epigraphy of this site, which show that there are almost twice as many fourth century texts as third. Deduction from the epigraphic evidence of Lepcis' excavated sites points, therefore, to an extensive and irremediable loss of texts relating to second and third century patrons, and it can only be hoped that excavations in the remaining (and undiscovered) forum, the Ulpian, will prove more fruitful.

Approximately 2/3 of the epigraphic mentions of patrons (21/34) and of all texts datable to within a reign (151/219) derive from Lepcis' two fora and theatre⁹. Thereafter, the correlation begins to break down. Excluding texts referring to patrons, the general tendency of the third century to predominate, is as manifest in this control group from Lepcis' two fora and theatre, as in Lepcis epigraphy in general. Again, excluding texts referring to patrons, the figures for each century are proportionately similar between texts datable to within a reign from the control group, and from all other Lepcis texts which can be so dated¹⁰. Epigraphic mentions of patrons from these three sites are, by contrast, highest in the fourth century (2/3 (or 14/21) for all texts, and 9/13 in the case of texts only datable to within a reign). Moreover, although the total number of known first and fourth century patrons of Lepcis is identical (15), this is not indicated by the figures from the control group. As the following chart (B) indicates, 11 of the 15 first century texts are dispersed over seven sites outside the two fora and theatre. The fourth century texts, by contrast, are, with one exception (A157), all from Lepcis' two fora (13 deriving from the forum Severianum). Finally,

⁷ A174.

⁸ C2 - D78: C3 B108, 135.

⁹ References to the 21 patrons appear on the following chart (chart B).

¹⁰ The proportion of fourth century texts is, however, somewhat high.

the distribution of texts mentioning patrons among the three sites is quite unrepresentative. Only one such text is known from the theatre, and the site where^{nc} most evidence of patrons derives, the forum Severianum, is precisely that which is least represented by all other inscriptions (datable to a reign) from the control group. Chronologically top heavy in the fourth century, geographically over-represented by the forum Severianum, the figures for texts referring^{to} ~~the~~ Lepcis' patrons from the two fora and theatre do not even accurately reflect the chronological distribution of ~~all~~ all the extant epigraphic mentions of Lepcis' patrons, let alone the reality of what must once have existed.

(B) Sites and References of Lepcis Texts Mentioning Patrons

Site	C1	C2	C3	C4-C5	Total
forum vetus	A21, 26, 35	-	-	C174	4
forum Severianum	-	D71	B108, 135	A156, 158, 159, 176a, 180, 181, 182, 183, 193, 194, 195, 196, 204	16
theatre	A6	-	-	-	1
market	A5, 10	-	-	-	2
Severan	-	-	-	C157	1
basilica					
arch	A11, 12 (two texts)	-	-	-	2
Byzantine gate	A27a, 28 (one text)	-	-	-	2
port area	A23	-	-	-	1
temple in	A14	-	-	-	1
portico behind theatre					
between theatre and chalcidicum building	A34	-	-	-	1
N.W. of market	A30	-	-	-	1
site unknown	A25	A49	-	-	2
Total	15	2	2	15	34

Analysis of the figures of all texts datable to a reign, regardless of location, and comparison between those texts which mention or fail to mention patrons is provided in chart (C) below. (References to the texts may be gained from list (A)). All lists to chapters appear in the second volume).

(C) Comparison of Datable Texts, with and without mention of Patrons.

Date	Patron Mentioned	No Patron Mentioned	Total
31BC-AD14	2	9	11
14-4	3 (2 patrons on 2 texts)	12	15
41-69	3	7	10
70-96	5 (2 patrons on 1 text)	12	17
96-117	-	8	8
117-138	-	12	12
138-161	1	20	21
161-180	-	5	5
180-192	-	4	4
193-222	-	76	76
222-244	1	7	8
244-284	-	9	9
284-305	3	1	4
305-337	1	10	11
337-363	2	5	7
363-423	4	9	13
Total	25	206	231

It is immediately evident from the figures in the total column, that there is no regular numerical increase of inscriptions from reign to reign. The large increase of extant epigraphy in the third century is almost entirely due to the very high figure (76) under the Severans. This figure, well over thrice that of the next highest dating block (that of Antoninus Pius with 21), corresponds with the large literary and architectural evidence for a massive building programme undertaken by Septimius. As with the dramatic slump in surviving epigraphy for the remainder of the third century, the high number of extant Severan texts is likely to be an authentic reflection of the city's fortunes (cf. IRT p.78), and finds parallels (albeit less extreme) elsewhere in Africa. The figures for the fourth - early fifth century, on the other hand, are misleadingly

small, as a far higher proportion cannot be assigned to a reign (64/100 - cf. 16/69 - C1,37/87 - C2, 36/129 - C3). No other African community possesses a higher proportion of extant first century texts than Lepcis Magna. Although the majority (20/53 datable to within a reign) derive from the forum vetus, there is (as seen above, with texts recording first century patrons) an overall wide dispersal of find spots. This factor, together with evidence both from the texts themselves, and from the impressive archaeological remains, makes it probable that this high survival rate is not an undue distortion. The distribution of texts per dating block is more level than in any other century. The highest figure (17), belonging to the Flavian era, is explicable, perhaps, by a renewed upsurge in ambitious building projects manifesting itself under Vespasian, whose reign signified the end of the turmoil of 69, the crushing of the Garamantes and the promotion of Lepcis to municipal status¹¹. The evidence for the second century is far less satisfactory. The texts increase numerically from one reign to the next, peaking at 21 under Antoninus Pius, and then plunge down to 5 and 4 for Marcus and Commodus. Important building programmes can be associated with the names of two of Marcus' predecessors (the Ulpian basilica and forum, and the Hadrian baths), and a lavish embellishment of the theatre was undertaken at municipal and private expense in the reign of Antoninus Pius (IRT 372,375,533-5). It would, therefore, seem a strong probability, particularly in light of the impoverished sources for the reign of Marcus and his son (no inscribed statue base, for example, dedicated to Marcus has survived), that some major area of Antonine construction, other than the recently discovered circus (AE (1968) 550), remains to be located.

From this overview of the chronological pattern of distribution of Lepcis' texts, it is apparent that we are most poorly served by the second century (and in particular the years 161-192), and by the reign of Diocletian, whose rule witnessed the restoration, if not the renaissance, of numerous African towns (cf. C. Lepelley, 'Les cités',

¹¹ cf. M. Le Glay, 'Les Flaviens et l'Afrique', MEFR, 80 (1968) pp.215-6 (Garamantes) 232 (road linking Lepcis Magna to Fezzan); J. Gascou, 'La politique municipale', ANRW, X,2 (1982) p.165 (promotion to Latin municipium, AD69-78), P. MacKendrick, 'The North African Stones Speak', London, 1980, p.148 (temples to the Flavians cf. IRT348), IRT300 (temple of Magna Mater), 318,347 (altar and podium in theatre), 342 (arch), 343,344,345,346,349,349a,350,351,516 (unspecified monuments).

p.336). These gaps in the record of Lepcitane epigraphy are as nothing, compared to the abysses we face, when we turn to the 25 texts, datable to within a reign, which refer to patrons. If comparison is now made with these, it will be seen, that while those of the first century bear some resemblance in their distribution by dating block with the generality of first century texts, datable to within a reign (with every block represented, and with a peak in the Flavian epoch), it is difficult to find any correlation at all for the remainder. Admittedly, the only second century text datable to within a reign, corresponds with the highest dating block (Antoninus Pius), yet the only third century text, so datable, falls not in the most represented block of all, the Severan, but dates to the reign of Severus Alexander. Again, in the dominate, whilst every block is represented, the reign of Diocletian, to which the least number of texts can be assigned (and these only approximately), contains almost as many references to patrons as the best represented period (the post-Julianic).

Lepcis Magna provides a higher total of patrons than any other African community (34). Her nearest rivals, Thamugadi with 29 and Thugga with 27, actually possess more texts referring to patrons (51 and 46 respectively, cf. 33 only from Lepcis), as many as seven texts being recorded for some of their patrons (A221, 228 and cf. B38 with 6). In fact, the proportion of inscriptions from Thamugadi and Thugga referring to patrons is some three to four times higher than that from Lepcis. Nevertheless, the proportion of Lepcitane texts mentioning patrons is still high - over twice that of comparable cities. Lepcis is one of only nine African communities, whose total number of inscriptions (excluding all milestones, all quarry marks and all (non-metrical) epitaphs of persons of slave, freed or unknown status)¹² exceeds 150, and for where, five or more inscriptions mentioning patrons are known. Listed in

¹² The inflationary effect of such epitaphs can be extreme (cf. Cirta, Thugga, Madauros and Volubilis where the unadjusted figures are respectively 1524 (vs. 378), 1069 (vs. 338), 850 (vs. 236) 473 (vs. 188). With the exception of Lepcis, where all published inscriptions, have been included in the total (and some unpublished inscriptions, where information about them is available) and Thamugadi, where important texts from MEFR, 65 (1953) pp.99-137, *Ant. Af.*, II (1968) pp.197-220 and *ib.* CXXI (1985) pp.103-36 have been included, only the following volumes of inscriptions (where relevant) have been employed: ILA, IRT, ILT, ILAlg, IAM, CIL VIII, AE (1900-1985). In consequence, the total for texts referring to patrons from Thamugadi and Cuicul (where sources are widely dispersed), has been reduced accordingly (texts from BACTH, Libya and earlier volumes of AE being omitted), and several unpublished Thuggan texts have likewise been excluded.

descending order, according to the size the proportion of texts referring to patrons represents, they are:

Town	Total of Inscriptions (Less Epitaphs)	Total of Inscriptions Mentioning Patrons	Proportions
(1) Thamugadi	285	47	c 1/6
(2) Thugga	338	45	c 1/7
(3) Cuicul	178	13	c 1/4
(4) Lepcis Magna	552	33	c 1/17
(5) Calama	158	5	c 1/31
(6) Cirta	378	11	c 1/34
(7) Volubilis	188	5	c 1/39
(8) Sabratha	194	5	c 1/39
(9) Madauros	236	6	c 1/39

From the above chart, it can be observed that Lepcis, (together with Cuicul), occupies a position between the very high proportions recorded for Thamugadi and Thugga (c1/6-1/7), and the rather low proportion (c1/31 - 1/39) for remaining communities, but somewhat closer to the latter. It may not be insignificant, that the three towns with the highest proportions, are precisely those for which (with the exception of the now very outdated work by E. Boeswillald, R. Cagnat and A. Ballu, 'Timgad une cité africaine sous l'empire romaine', Paris, 1905) no specific epigraphic corpus has yet been compiled. On this view, the proportions for Thamugadi, Thugga and Cuicul may be misleadingly high, with the figure for the total of inscriptions (less epitaphs) from these towns being much closer to that for Lepcis (the highest of the nine). Be that as it may, we can make the general observation that a large number of texts referring to patrons from one site, will normally indicate a high proportion of such texts in relation to the site's total epigraphy (less epitaphs)¹³.

It has been seen from comparison with Thamugadi, Thugga, and to a lesser extent Cuicul and Cirta, that the numerous surviving epigraphic references to patrons from

¹³ The figures for two of the nine sites discussed (Cirta and Cuicul) do, however, sit uncomfortably with the rest in this scenario.

Lepcis does not make her unique. That Lepcis alone has been singled out from a study of group (A) patrons, rests on three tenets. Firstly, while the numbers of patrons from group (A) known for Thamugadi and Cuicul are relatively large (17 and 10 respectively), even though not to be compared to Lepcis' 29, there is considerable evidence in Numidia of multiple patrocina by members of group (A) - and in particular for legates of III Augusta - which indicates that the high figures for these towns reflects a provincial pattern, at least among five of Numidia's six principal towns (Thamugadi, Cuicul, Cirta, Diana Veteranorum and Verecunda. No patrons are attested by Lambaesis prior to her promotion to municipal capital under Severus). Cirta and Thugga do not concern us here, Cirta having only five patrons of group (A), and Thugga none at all. Secondly, and most importantly, the texts of Lepcis' known patrons, while illuminating the first and fourth centuries, are so seriously deficient in the second and third centuries, as to confound any general overview of the chronological framework of patrons of group (A) in Africa as a whole, let alone Africa Proconsularis¹⁴. Thirdly, the exceptionally high survival of Lepcis' patrons is to be contrasted with the absolute paucity of known patrons from Carthage, capital of Africa Proconsularis. With almost 3,000 surviving inscriptions, Carthage easily exceeds the epigraphic total of any other African city, but the overwhelming majority of these texts are funerary inscriptions, while the far fewer monumental and honorific inscriptions are rarely found other than in fragments. The sum of all epigraphic references to patrons of Carthage is (excluding one doubtful case (ILA 389) merely three, and of these, two were discovered not in Carthage, but Italy (D2,A50). Only one of the three patrons (a proconsul of Africa under Pius, Q. Pompeius Vopiscus, A50) is a member of group (A). The other two comprise a consul designate and augur with no known attachment to the city or province (D2), and a local clarissimus II vir of (B186). They date respectively to the triumvirate and to the third-fourth century. While the almost regular succession of proconsules Africae co-opted as patrons at Lepcis (at least for the first century) may reflect the practice in the capital, the truth is

¹⁴ The chronological spread of patrons from Thamugadi and Cuicul is, by contrast, far more even.

that there is very little available evidence on which to assess the rôle of proconsuls as patrons in provincial capitals.

In Carthage, the sole example, Vopiscus, may have owed to special circumstances, not only the distinction of having his statue erected by the Carthaginian *ordo*, in the forum of his native city Volsena, but even his initial co-optation as patron. Vopiscus (in the view of Gros, see below pp.62-3) may have had in his purview the monumental reconstruction of the city centre at Byrsa, and zeal in this undertaking, even perhaps to the extent of some personal endowment, may lie behind his co-optation.

If we turn to Ephesus, seat of the proconsul of Asia, not one of the seven recorded patrons there (I.v. Eph 614A, 630A, 663, 678, 998, 1540, 2941) is proconsul, although one (I.v. Eph 1540) is his legate. By analogy with Africa, where seven of the nine recorded patrons among legates of the proconsul of Africa (from group (A)) shared this distinction with their superior¹⁵, there is a strong likelihood that we can lay claim to at least one proconsul of Asia as patron of Ephesus on the same grounds. Two, possibly four, proconsuls of Pontus - Bithynia are, however, known as patrons of the capital Nicomedia under Claudius, the evidence being principally numismatic^{16a}. No other patrons are recorded for the city. For Athens, seat of the proconsul of Achaëa, there is only one patron known, Severus' praetorian prefect C. Fulvius Plautianus, (AJA (1941)p.89), while no patrons at all are known for Corduba, residence of the proconsul of Baetica or for the capitals of the other proconsular provinces. In sum, only 12 texts and a small quantity of coin types from the four seats of proconsules provinciae have survived which refer to their patrons, of whom, only three are certainly attested as proconsul. If the ambiguous evidence for the patronate of three proconsular patrons (see above under Ephesus and Nicomedia) be put aside, the proportion of proconsular to non-proconsular patrons of provincial

¹⁵ (A 11-12 and 27a-28 at Lepcis, A14a-15 at Hippo Regius, A52-54 at Gighis, and A120-122 at Thubursicu Bure, cf. A67).

^{16a} C. Cadius Rufus, C6.1508, nummi (cf. PIR, C6, tituli (c) 1-2), P. Pasidienus Firmus, nummi (cf. PIR, P103 and T. Nicols, 'Zur Verleihung öffentlicher Ehrungen in der römischen Welt', Chiron, IX (1979) p.256), L. Mindius Pollio ?, nummi (cf. PIR, M598 and J. Nicols, loc. cit.), L. Mindius Balbus ?, nummi (cf. PIR, M597).

capitals is only 30.77% (4/13). On the other hand, argument against the frequent co-optation of governors based on statistics drawn from primary sources as impoverished as these, has inherent dangers and is further weakened by the fact that five, possibly six texts, antedate the imperial period, with which municipal patronage in Africa is chiefly concerned (Carthage - C14.3165, Ephesus IV.Eph. 614A, 630A, 663, 2941 and ?998). Also, the far greater body of evidence for capitals outside of the proconsular provinces indicates that there, at least, the co-optation of governors was not unusual, and possibly the norm.

Five of Africa's seven other provincial capitals illustrate this point. The two provinces separated by Diocletian from Africa Proconsularis, Byzacena and Tripolitana, had as their new capitals, Hadrumetum and Lepcis Magna. Little epigraphic evidence of municipal affairs has survived from Hadrumetum, and our only evidence for patronage of the town after its elevation to provincial capital comes from Rome. The individual concerned was a governor, a *clarissimus praeses*. The string of praesides honoured as patrons by Lepcis during the fourth century, closely parallels our evidence for the first century, when proconsuls were likewise frequently co-opted as patrons by the *ordo* (A158, 159, 176a, 182, 193, 194, 195, 204, C174). In fact, all of Lepcis' 5 remaining patrons for this period were important administrators, two were proconsuls (A156,180), two were vicars (A181,183), and the other, an unknown official, possibly a praeses (A196 cf. C. Lepelley, 'Les cités' II, p.345). As we have noticed (p.46), Lambaesis does not record any patrons prior to its promotion as capital (and the quantity of Lambaesis' epigraphy is second only to that of Carthage). Admittedly, only three patrons are known, but all are governors (two legates of III Augusta (A238a and 246) and one praeses (A251)). Under Constantine, Lambaesis lost its position as capital of the province of Numidia, and the honour was transferred to Cirta, which adopted the name (which it still bears today) of its benefactor. Only one patron of Constantine has come down to us, Ceionius Italicus (A259), and he was also a governor (consularis of Numidia). In Volubilis, all three of the four attested patrons whose posts are known, governed the province of Mauretania Tingitana, one legate

(A272a), and two praesides (A288, 290). Mauretania's two other provincial capitals, Caesarea and Sitifis, are singularly disappointing in their epigraphic testimony of municipal affairs. Only two patrons of the early first century, the kings Iuba and Ptolemy are known from Caesarea (B268,269), and none at all are known from Sitifis, another of Diocletian's new capitals. From the relevant texts referring to patrons from Africa's other provincial capitals, all but three (from Lepcis) of the 20 concern the governor, whose seat of residence lay there (excluded from the total are the texts from Lepcis and Volubilis, where the post of the patron is unknown, (D279,A196), and, of course, the two texts from Caesarea (B268,269) prior to the creation of Mauretania Caesariensis).

If the testimony from Africa's other provincial capitals is any guide - and there is external corroboration from elsewhere in the empire¹⁶ - the enrolment of patrons in Carthage (as in Ephesus, Athens and Corduba) must have been frequent, if not standard (but cf. NC22), practice. If the prestige of such a conferment was great, so too was the proconsul's potential to reward the city and favour its leading citizens. That our sources throw so little light on the matter seems rather a reflection of the impoverished nature of our extant material than of the historical situation in Carthage and the other three proconsular capitals. If this is so, a very large number of patrons of communities in Africa Proconsularis from group (A) (possibly the majority if their co-optation was regular in the capital and occasional elsewhere) were patrons of Carthage. That only one such reference survives obviously impacts heavily on any statistical assessment of group (A) from this province. This extreme imbalance, compounded of course by the chronological disarray of the extant Lepcis texts, does not occur in Numidia (although the poverty of first century material from Cirta is much to be regretted)¹⁷ and the effect of the virtual absence of patrons from Caesarea and

¹⁶ (e.g. Tarraco (RIT,129 and 151), Lugudunum (C13.1797), Arelate (AE (1930)70, Cemenelum (C5.7880), Sarmizegethusa (C3.1456, 1458,1463,1465,AE (1972) 466), Ancyra (IGRI,138).

¹⁷ First century texts from Cirta are rare, ^{and} include only two references to administrators (ILAlgII550,551-proconsules Africae, cf. IL AlgIIp.40). The earliest text relating to Cirta, concerning the assignation of land to colonists by Cirtan II viri in 26BC, derives from a dependant castellum at Ksar Mahidjiba (cf. ILAlgII4226=AE (1955) 202, and J. Gascou, 'Les magistratures de la Confédération Cirtéenne', BACTH, 17B (1981) pp.323-5).

Sitifis is lessened by the paucity of material elsewhere in Mauretania (excepting Tingitana).

Chapter III Group (A) - Patronal Origins, Families and Estates

Before discussion and analysis of the personae of group (A) and their activities, a caveat needs to be sounded regarding their place of origin. Our knowledge of the patria of members of the senatorial and equestrian ordines, is regrettably, highly deficient in many cases. This is particularly true of those following an administrative or military cursus, many of whom are only known from texts inscribed whilst abroad on service, in which context mention of origo was unnecessary and rarely forthcoming. Genealogy, nomenclature and even cursus (where a local magistracy or priesthood is mentioned) can sometimes throw their origins into relief, but this is not the case for the majority.

Of the 108 patrons whom I have listed in group (A), only an embarrassingly reduced figure of 65¹ can be said with some degree of certainty not to have originated in the African province in which they served the emperor. 14 of the 43 doubtful cases refer to anonymous individuals and can obviously furnish no clues as to their origo². Another five patrons, for whom various authorities have tentatively assigned an African background, I have preferred to retain in group (A) not (C), as the evidence for their African origin is meagre and contestable³. 24 patrons of uncertain origin remain, of whom all bar one are known only from texts erected in Africa during their administration⁴. The exception is a certain Antonius Marcellinus (A163) of 'illustris familia', known from three Christian authors, who describe him as father (Jerome and Palladius) or grandfather (Paulinus of Nola) of the renowned Melania (cf. PLRE Marcellinus 16). Melania was Spanish, but whether from her father's or mother's

¹ A3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 43, 44, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 61, 62, 89A, 109, 120, 121, 122, 164, 177, 180, 181, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 217, 218, 220, 225, 227, 228, 231, 233, 234, 238, 242, 248, 250, 251, 265, 272, 273, 275, 290, 301 (=65)

² A159, 172, 173, 183, 196, 198, 201, 212, 239, 253, 254, 255, 277, 278 (=14)

³ A60, 246, 256, 257, 259 (=5)

⁴ A24, 199, 156, 158, 163, 165, (=175), 171, 176, 182, 193, 194, 195, 204, 221, 226, 229, 230, 237, 249, 257A, 288, 289, 300 (=24)

side (or both) is unknown. Arnheim's argument⁵ that Marcellinus is unlikely to have been Spanish, because no Spanish post is known for him, is unconvincing. Marcellinus' origins remain a mystery - 'possibly Spanish' is the best we can do. For the other 23 patrons, nomenclature occasionally throws a glimmer of light on their origins, but no more. There is certainly nothing substantial. Examples are (A) C. Iulius (Scapula) Lepidus Tertullus (A237) patron of Cuicul, whose family share a rare cognomen (Scapula) with a gens from Ostia, the C. Iulii Ostorii Scapulae (cf. PIR, I553) and may themselves be Ostian; and (B) D. Fonteius Frontinianus L. Stertinus Rufinus (A226-226b) patron of 3 Numidian towns, whose descendant, a Fonteia Frontina, married into the Maesii of Thermae in Sicily (D1083) and may just possibly also be a native of the region.

The 43 patrons of uncertain origin represent a large percentage (39.81%) of group (A), who could be potentially *patroni patriae* as well as administrators, and thus belong in fact to group (C). It must be admitted, on the other hand, that there is nothing in the texts themselves to distinguish them from the *bona fide*, non-African representatives of group (A), whereas the majority of texts for group (C) clearly enunciate (and reveal an obvious pride in) the patron's local origins. Since the 43 patrons are indistinguishable as a group from the rest of group (A), except for the uncertainty of their origins, a further subdivision of African administrators appears to me to be minimally instructive, but their existence should be borne in mind.

A distinctive feature of patrons in group (A), is that with one exception (see below), their family members are not recorded as having been themselves patrons in the same province, unless of course they too served there as administrators (sons of proconsuls of Africa for example acting as legates - see A53,54,121,122). The situation is one which contrasts noticeably with that for groups (B) and (C), where there is considerable evidence for the co-optation of patrons' children, and even their wives. The co-optation of children, at least, might be thought to have been guaranteed by the

⁵ 'The Senatorial Aristocracy in the Later Roman Empire', Oxford (1972)p.77.

terms of the contract between patron and client, the *tabula patronatus*⁶. Almost all of the known African *tabulae* specify that the client makes *hospitium*, not only with the patron, but also with his children and descendants. As patrons of group (A) are most in evidence on the African *tabulae*, it may be suggested, that the failure of their children to appear as patrons (unless themselves administrators) indicates that the 'inheritance clause' on *tabulae* either was, or had become, an empty formula. If patrons *de iure*, it appears they were never so in practice. Several dedications by the *ordo* to the children of non-local administrators are known, none of which describe the honorand as patron⁷.

Omission of *patrocinium* on texts of this type is the nearest proof we are likely to obtain for non-co-optation (at least at the time the dedication was erected). Even for the children of local patrons, for whom, perhaps, the 'inheritance clause' was initially intended, there was no guarantee that the clause would be universally applied (see pp.186ff.). Continuity of contact with their *patria*, combined with *noblesse oblige*, however, obviously made the children of patrons particularly promising candidates for co-optation in their own right, and thus we not infrequently find African communities conferring the patronate on children of quite tender years. Conversely, for the children of non-local patrons who had served as administrators, contact with their father's client after the expiry of their father's office was, of course, a far from certain matter, and their sense of obligation to the client scarcely likely to develop during their initial transient residence there, whilst only a child or youth.

⁶ Wives are never included with descendants in the formulaic extension of co-optation on African *tabulae patronatus*, although one example from *Tarraconensis* exists (AE (1961)96). The *Tarraconensis* plaque suggests what one would expect, viz. that the co-optation of wives was an exceptional occurrence, and one always reliant on the former or joint co-optation of the husband.

⁷ The following are attested as honorands of statues by the *ordo*.

(1) M. Aemilius Dinarchus, M. Aemili Macri leg. Aug. pr. pr. c.v. filius (Verecunda, C4228).

(2) His brother M. Aemilius Saturninus (Verecunda, C4229).

(3) A. Iulius Celsus, c.p., A. Iuli Pompili Pisonis Levilli leg. Aug. pr. pr. cos. designati patroni col. filius (Cuicul, AE (1916) 31).

(5) Val. Concordius, filius Val. Mircelliani (sic), v.p. p(raesidis) et patroni n. (Volubilis, ZPE, 68 (1987) p.197).

(6) M. Maturius [Vi]ctor, filius M. Maturi Victorini, v.e., praesidis et patr[o]ni nost. (Volubilis -IAM416).

(7) Passienus Rufus, tribunus mil. legionis XII Fulminatae, Pass[ieni] Rufi (procos. Africae) filius (Thugga, C26850).

The only family member of a group (A) patron co-opted in Africa without having herself occupied an official post, a certain Fabia V[ic]t[or]ia Iovina (A257), is a particularly dubious exception to the rule. Her husband, L. Lucceius Hadrianus (A256), was a *vir perfectissimus* and *rationalis*. In his commentary on the text, H.G. Pflaum assumes that he was *rationalis* Numidia^o et Mauretaniarum (IL AlgII666), a view followed by PLRE Hadrianus 3. This need not be the case if the patria of the *rationalis* were the same as the client community (Cirta) which erected the dedication to his wife. Lucceius could, on this view, have retired in Cirta after serving as a *rationalis* in Rome. Lucceius could also of course, have been both *rationalis* Numidia^o et Ma^uretaniarum and a local man. Against either of these two scenarios is the total absence of the nomen Lucceius from Cirta, and its rarity in the region (only one instance from Celtianis, and five from Thibilis - IL AlgII3026, 5572-6). Hadrianus is likewise an extremely uncommon cognomen in Africa (there are only two occurrences of Africans bearing the name in CILVIII index). His wife on the other hand may very well have been a local, the nomen being well attested in Cirta (IL Alg II 682 1124-32), and her cognomen Victoria being the most preferred of all feminine cognomina in Africa. Being both the wife of an important imperial administrator, and a member of an eminent local family (at least one of the Cirtan Fabii had a municipal career - IL Alg II 682), would be telling reasons for Fabia's co-optation. Firmer proof of local origin cannot, however, be supplied, and in consequence she has been placed in group (A), rather than (C).

If the descendants of group (A) patrons were never *de facto* patrons of African communities, did the patrons themselves ever assume any patronal responsibility once they had quitted their African post? One possible example of continued patronage beyond the expiry of office concerns the patron Vulcacius Rufinus, a former *consularis* of Numidia, who is given pride of place at the head of the list of patrons on the celebrated album of Timgad, some 20 years after the termination of his command. Rufinus is known to have owned a villa at Rome on the Quirinal, where he is found

residing some five years or more after leaving Numidia (D1237)⁸. His half brother Neratius Cerealis is also known to have inherited a large domus on the Esquiline⁹.

While it is clear that the principal residence of both brothers was Rome, Roman origin for Vulcaci^{us} is far less certain than for his half-brother Neratius, whose antecedents in Rome occupied the domus Neratiorum at least as early as the beginning of the C2¹⁰. The father of Vulcaci^{us}, or even his mother, neither of whom are known, may have had Numidian connections. The nomen Vulcaci^{us} is extremely rare in Africa, particularly with this spelling, but does turn up at Thamugadi in the person of the veteran Vulcaci^{us} Saturninus (AE (1936) 33,34). Descent from this individual is, at least, possible, but connection with the city through marriage, and/or the acquisition of estates there whilst consularis may also be mooted. That some deeper relationship existed between Vulcaci^{us} and Thamugadi than that casually formed by a passing administrator, seems demanded by his commemoration on the city's album twenty years later, when neither the present incumbent as consularis, nor two intervening consulares, whose names are known to us, appear as patrons. Vulcaci^{us} was well able to benefit Thamugadi whilst residing in Rome, by virtue of his pronounced forensic and rhetorical skills, his occupancy of important imperial posts (including three praetorian prefectures), and his impressive connections, which included relationship to the imperial family¹¹. The situation recalls that of Fronto, also close to the heart of power in Rome, and courted by a Numidian city to which he was connected, for patronal favours.

The special bond which Vulcaci^{us} appears to have enjoyed with Thamugadi finds no parallels amongst other group (A) patrons and their African clients, and attribution to

⁸ cf. C6.32051 cited by PLRE, Rufinus 25, for a dedication by the citizens of Ravenna ('Ravennates') to Vulcaci^{us}, erected 'in vestibulo domus'.

⁹cf. PLRE Cerealis 2, and M. Torelli, *Tituli V* pp.177-8 for the vast baths constructed by Cerealis on part of his Roman acquisitions, and the texts by which he is referred to as 'conditor balnearum'. The baths were formerly a domus Neratiorum. Two Neratii brothers, Proculus and Marcellus, at the beginning of the C2 were perhaps the first of the family to acquire the property (see M. Torelli, loc. cit.).

¹⁰ domus Neratiorum - see note above. A. Chastagnol's conviction that Vulcaci^{us} did not belong to Thamugadis' aristocracy but was Roman by origin ('L' album municipal de Timgad', Bonn, 1978 p.42, 50 n.5 and cf. C. Lepelley, 'Les Cités' I 269 and II 462 for the same view.) is vitiated by the possibility of such a connection through his anonymous parents. Chastagnol nowhere notes the unparalleled formal continuation of Vulcaci^{us} as patron, so long after his administration of Numidia had ceased.

¹¹ Vulcaci^{us}' sister Galla was mother of the Caesar Gallus, Julian's violent half-brother.

group (C) seems the most probable solution. The transience of provincial administrators, whose tenure of office rarely extended beyond a year, and the fact that so many were accorded the patronate whilst in authority, suggests that contact with them by former clients beyond their term of office, would necessarily have restricted itself to those few, who had either established close ties of *amicitia* with the local gentry, or attained a particular reputation for approachability, in combination with easy access to the imperial inner circle. In fact, we cannot even be certain of this, since evidence of intercession by any group (A) patron after the expiry of his African administration does not exist. Thus, although there is occasional mention of the *industria* (A278), *merita* (A119), and *benivolentia* (A242) of group (A) patrons in the C2 and C3, and this refrain rises to a crescendo in the C4, not a single text for any which mentions their patronate, suggests that any such generous disposition towards the communities, continued beyond the expiry of their office.

The actual evidence for any contact between African communities and patrons residing abroad, reduces itself to Fronto's reply to the triumviri and decuriones of Cirta (*Ad Amicos* II, 11) and to four statue bases erected in Italy, by client communities to patrons, only two of whom were administrators. Fronto's letter is one of the very rare literary references to municipal patronage in Africa¹². In his reply (the letter from the Cirtan magistrates is unfortunately lost), Fronto, having apparently turned down an offer to be co-opted patron himself on the grounds of health, suggests that the *ordo* direct its attention towards three alternative senators. It is instructive that firstly, Fronto was an *ex-patriate* of Cirta; that secondly, all the persons whom Fronto recommends are consulars with experience at the bar ('*qui nunc fori principem locum occupant*') but - like Fronto himself - with no previous administrative experience in Africa; that thirdly - two of the persons proposed by Fronto came from near Cirta, while the other, Aufidius Victorinus, was his son-in-law, and hence connected to the Cirtan nobility by marriage; and that finally, despite their African connections, all of

¹² The only other reference is St. Augustine, *Contra Academicos*, I,2 but a probable reference to patronate of the province of Africa has been noted by Krause, 170 in Claudian, *de cons. Fl. Malli Theodori v.c. panegyris*, 24 ff..

Fronto's nominees appear to have lived on a more or less permanent basis in Rome. There was evidently nothing unusual, then, in an African community having as its patron an important individual, who habitually resided abroad, and whose eloquence might be placed at its disposal. The situation is not so different, perhaps, from that of a client community approaching one of the several known persons from group (A) who regularly resided in Rome or its vicinity, and who enjoyed prestige, influence in court, and oratorical prowess. On the other hand, where communities like Cirta were fortunate enough to have their own citizens well placed in positions of power and influence, there were obvious advantages in enlisting their aid in preference to that of ex-administrators with no local ties. Not only did locals, or men with local connections, have a personal stake in advancing the welfare of the community concerned, but these very ties put them under an obligation to respond to the community's needs. When Fronto (however hollowly) expresses the sentiment that the strengthening of his patria was far preferable to him than furthering his own interests, he is all too uncomfortably aware of the moral obligations that came with his position. To avert, as far as he can, the loss of prestige at home incurred by his refusal, he is particular to nominate persons from his own circle of amici, who resemble him in their consular status, their rhetorical expertise and their connections with Cirta. His sense of duty towards his native town impels him to extol first and loudest the suitability of his own son-in-law, who, we may presume, was first consulted on the matter.

Fronto's failure to nominate persons other than those with an African connection, is explicable in the context of his having declined an offer of co-optation himself, since duty and self-interest coincided to make a choice of replacements from among his circle of relatives and African amici inevitable. As it happens, we know of other patrons of Cirta at this date, one in fact being a local senator with legal experience (as III vir capitalis - A223-4). Cirta had, as Fronto rather pointedly comments, an impressive array of local clarissimi at this time, yet it continued, at least spasmodically, to enroll Numidian legates of non-local background. Unfortunately, Fronto's letter

cannot be used as evidence either for, or against, the communication of client communities with Numidian legates, or with any other office holders from group (A), after the expiry of their term of appointment. Although Fronto does suggest that influential senators with forensic experience residing in Rome were in demand as patrons by African communities (and we must imagine that their services were often called upon), the only examples he provides are of senators who enjoyed a personal connection with the client.

Communication between African communities and patrons residing abroad can be documented by four other examples. The patrons are all senators, and the mode of communication, statues erected in their honour in Italy by client communities, who presumably sent a small delegation abroad for this purpose. Two of those concerned, however, are not known as administrators in Africa. One, Uttiedius Afer (D2), consul designate in the late C1 BC, is honoured in his Tiburtine villa by Carthage. Some service on the city's behalf may have occasioned either co-optation or the statue's dedication. After a century of decline, Carthage was again launched on the world stage with Caesar's establishment of a colony there in 44 BC. Our text dates to the following decade, when the civil war which engulfed the Roman world saw part of the colony displaced. Uttiedius' part in these momentous events is unknown, but his involvement with the city may well have initially been formed by a decision to invest heavily in land and property in the first surge of speculative fever that inevitably accompanied the city's resettlement. The political upheaval which followed would have bound Uttiedius and the colonists together in defence of their mutual interests, and provided the senator with ample opportunity to exercise his patronal obligations.

The other patron honoured in Italy, who likewise held no administrative post in Africa, is the quaestor designate, M. Num[mius-]Attidi[us-] Tuscus [-] (B76). His patronate of the unknown African municipium which erected a statue to him at Rome, is best explicable by African origo, and Carthage may be pronounced his most likely patria, given the close association of later collaterals with the city, as administrators and businessmen. One, M. Nummius Umbrius Primus Senecio Albinus (AE(1969-70)

169 cf. PIR, N238, and F. Jacques, 'Les curateurs des cités africaines au III^e siècle', ANRW X,2 (1982) p.134), was curator of the city c200-202, and later legate of his father, the proconsul of Africa. Two others, Nummius Tuscus and Nummius Albinus, evidently owned figlinae in Carthage in the mid C3, their names appearing on pottery sherds found there (AE(1926) 28 cf. PIR, N237,227)¹³. It is unclear whether our Nummius had taken up permanent residence in Rome, or was there temporarily, perhaps in connection with his entry upon a senatorial cursus. In either case, it was not difficult for him to commute regularly between Rome and Carthage, such visits, perhaps, encompassing a detour to praedia and/or family in the vicinity of the unknown client.

The two remaining patrons attested by statues in Italy were both proconsuls of Africa during the latter half of the C2 (155-6 and 189-90). No post in either dedication - and both provide a full cursus - can be assigned beyond the proconsulate. In the case of one patron (A67), M. Didius Severus Iulianus, we can be certain that the dedication was erected no later than two years three months after the expiry of his proconsulate (190), his imperial ambitions having by then led to his ignominious murder. The description of the dedicand (Bisica Lucana) as 'ex Africa' clearly indicates that the base was intended for perusal by persons unfamiliar with the community's whereabouts (e.g. the amici of the recipient, who would see a copy displayed in his residence abroad)¹⁴. Its arrival in Rome was, therefore, not the work of later hands, but the result of a decision by Didius' client to honour him during, or immediately after, his proconsulship - after, one suspects. The dedication of a statue by Carthage at Volsinii

¹³ The collaterals of our Nummius were, however, Italian, despite their close identification with Carthage. M. Nummius Umbrius Primus Senecio Albinus, for example, son of another African administrator, the proconsul M. Umbrius Primus, was from Compsa, and was adopted into the Nummii Albini, a gens from Brixia (cf. PIR, N238, G. Camodeca, *Tituli IV* p.143, M. Christol, 'Essai sur l'évolution de la carrière sénatoriale dans la seconde moitié du III^e siècle', Paris, 1986 pp.214-18). That the Nummii Attidii were settled in Africa (Carthage) rather than Italy, is suggested by the youth of our patron (barely 25), as much as by the later links of the Nummii with Africa, all known patrons in Africa of a similar age or younger, being local or neighbouring citizens.

¹⁴ Cf. C5.6985-6 and 6987, 'civitas [Cor]nacatium ex Panno[nia]' and '[Cal]ago[rritani ex Hi]spania ci[teriore]' dedicands of statues to their patron at his Italian estates in Taurini. Similarly, one of the four African clients of C. Silius Aviola attested by tabulae patronatus in Silus' patria, Brixia, qualifies itself as 'civitas Themetra ex Africa'. Again, two tabulae patronatus to the legate of Mauretania, Sex. Sentius Caecilianus, another Italian, describe the clients provenance as 'ex provincia nova Mauretania Africa' (cf. A272-2a). Private African clients might also describe themselves as 'ex Africa', as in a dedication to a patron at Rome (C6.1366, cf. 'Personal Patrocinia' n.114).

to the other African proconsul, the polyonymous Q. Pompeius Vopiscus (A50), probably also took place within months of his return home, but as we know nothing further of his career, we cannot give any *terminus ante quem*.

Were Didius and Pompeius honoured with statues in their Italian villas as a matter of routine, for services whilst in office deemed out of the ordinary, or for assistance given (or promised) after quitting their post, following the successful visit of a delegation? The first scenario can probably be dismissed. Dedications of statues or plaques (other than *tabulae patronatus*) outside of the client community were not infrequently set up by Italian communities to patrons at Rome, but the practice - so far as our evidence allows - was not widespread in the western provinces. Apart from the four African examples, only nine patrons of seven other communities are attested¹⁵. One of these, Lucius, to whom the Lugudunenses erected a statue in Rome, can be discounted, since as heir apparent to the empire, he was deserving of special consideration. The dedications of the others were erected at their private estates in Rome, Capua, Taurini, Nemausus and Vienna. Like the African examples, none provide any hint as to why the dedications were made, and the dedicands include both large and insignificant communities.

At first impression, the perfunctory nature of the texts appears to support the view that their erection had become automatic, a privilege each retiring official could count on soon after his return from the province. That this impression is misleading can be observed by examining the nature of all statue bases erected by communities to patrons

15 (1) Rome:	L. Iulius Caesar	patron of	Lugudunum (C6.1400 & 1526)
(2) Rome:	Tullius Tuscus	patron of	Lugudunum (C6.1526)
(3) Rome:	L. Cassius Longinus	patron of	Arelate (AE (1930) 70)
(4) Rome:	L. Aelius Lamia	patron of	Vennenses (AE (1948) 93)
(5) Rome:	anon.	patron of	civitas Cadurcorum (C6.1568)
(6) Capua:	L. Fulvius Gavius	patron of	Lugudunum (C10.3856)
	Petronius Aemilianus		
(7) Taurini:	Q. Glitius Atilius	patron of	civitas Cornacatum (C5.6985-6)
	Agricola		
(8) Taurini	" " "	patron of	Calagorritani (C5.6987)
(9) Nemausus:	Ti. Iulius Maximus	patron of	" (C12.3167)
	Ma[-] Brocchus		
	Servilianus A.		
	Quadron[ius] L.		
	Servilius		
	Vatia Cassius Cam[-]		
(10) Vienna:	C. Iulius Pacatianus	patron of	Italica (C12.1856)

of African communities. Of 162 bases so far attested, 89 are equally reticent in suggesting why they were erected; 47 are content simply to praise the patron's virtue, industria etc., or employ some pithy circumlocution of the 'ob merita' variety, whilst a mere 26 - only 4 concerning administrators not known to have been local - actually indicate that some benefaction or specific service to the community took place¹⁶. It is only from other inscriptions that we can (occasionally) glean some basis behind the inscription's dedication. It is clear that in several cases, statues were erected to patrons some years after their co-optation, and it is a reasonable assumption that they were erected to mark the ordo's gratitude for some recent benefaction. In the majority of instances, we are unable to aver how soon after co-optation a statue was erected, and where no indication is given as to what occasioned the erection, it is difficult to determine whether or not this was preceded by some benefaction. On the other hand, there is a high representation of group (B) among those statue bases imparting no information as to the cause of their erection (49/89). With these local dignitaries, even where the erection of a statue marked the moment of their co-optation, some recent beneficence may have preceded the event. Many others will have inherited the patronate as *patroni a parentibus*, and for them the award of a statue must surely have signalled some generous action, promised or recently fulfilled. There are, then, grounds for believing that the reticence of many, perhaps most, statue bases erected to patrons in Africa, conceals some act of munificence or beneficial service towards the community, and the same presumably applies to those few statue bases which African and other provincial communities chose to erect abroad.

Yet, if indeed, these latter do veil some generous service on the part of the honorand, their very reticence precludes us from determining whether this occurred during their period of administration, or afterwards. On the other hand, no text erected outside the dedicating community, African or other, lists any post in the recipient's *cursus* later than that in which he officiated over the community involved. This suggests that

¹⁶ The 26 examples are; A176a, 180, 182a, 259, B45, 57, 58, 69, 72, 91, 101, 128, 137, 154, 190, 192, 200, 202, 235, 241, C79, 114, 123, 160, 174, 286, (cf. lists (A) and (B) 'Beneficia et Merita').

communication between the client and patron was not of long duration, and that it may, in fact, have been restricted to the specific occasion on which the statue was erected. The inspiration behind the dedication seems, therefore, to have been a desire to commemorate some beneficence performed during the patron's term of office, rather than after.

Returning to the two patrons of group (A), Didius and Pompeius, who were awarded statues in Italy by African communities, there is some peripheral evidence to suggest that their services whilst in office were such as to warrant some special mark of appreciation. Didius, although himself from Mediolanum, appears to have had connections with Africa. According to his *vita* (1.2), his maternal grandfather was Hadrumetine ('ex Adrumetina').¹⁷ Again, pottery sherds from Carthage, bearing the names of two (mid third century?) descendants of his step-brother Nummius Albinus, indicate a link between the Num^mii and Africa, which, it may be, was in existence in Didius' day. Didius may even have had an African descendant, if the Didius Iulianus from Thibilis, a person of high, possibly senatorial, rank was related (ILAlgII 4662 - but cf. commentary to ID27).

Nothing of course in Didius' surmised connections with Africa links him to Bisica, except for the statue base from Rome, and Bisica is in fact a considerable distance from both Hadrumetum and Thibilis. On the other hand, if there was an African connection, it is probable, given Didius' vast wealth, that it was not restricted to one part of the province. Didius may have owned estates in several areas including Bisica (even though Bisica's few inscriptions do not adduce any local Didii), any of which he could have visited or acquired whilst legate in the province (Bisica lies not far west of Thuburbo Maius - cf. n.17). If local ties lay behind the erection of a statue to him at Rome, that erected to Pompeius at Volsinii may have been occasioned by the gratitude Carthage felt for his part in overseeing the vast rebuilding of the city centre (cf. P.

¹⁷ A text from Thuburbo Maius (ILT699), in which Didius is found as legate of the jurist Salvian, appears to substantiate the claim by the *vita* that the two were related, the choice of a relative as legate being a common one. If the *vita* is right on this point (although Salvian must be avunculus or pro-avunculus rather than proavus) it may also be right about the Hadrumetine connection.

Gros, 'Une dédicace Carthaginoise sur le forum de Bolsena', *MEFR*, 92 (1980) 2, p.989, who even suggests a possible personal financial contribution).

Similar exceptional services to those which we have surmised for Didius and Pompeius may have motivated the erection of statues to other patrons outside of the province of the dedicand, though the evidence is less forthcoming. Alternatively, it may be that certain cities were more prone than others to erect honorific statues abroad, and may even have done so routinely. Leaving Italy aside, if we look at the 14 dedications made by western provincial communities, it is surprising to find that seven were erected by only three communities, Carthage, Lugudunum and the Calagorritani of Spain. Perhaps provincial capitals like the former two erected statues abroad frequently, even regularly to patrons, and were mimicked in this by some of the smaller communities. While the smallness of the known number of dedications erected by provincial communities outside of their province makes it improbable that all communities regularly so honoured their patrons, this small total may accommodate a scenario where only some of the communities did so with any sort of frequency. This view is, however, somewhat vitiated by the African evidence for two further communities which erected statues to individuals abroad (albeit not patrons).¹⁸

The laconic nature of the dedications erected abroad to individuals (whether patrons or not), and their relative rarity, are unpromising material on which to base any firm conclusions. Their existence shows that some communication took place between a client and patrons of group (A) after quitting their African office, but nothing suggests that this was due to services rendered from this time¹⁹. Their rarity suggests that erecting statues abroad was not a widespread practice, but the relative high frequency of some of the dedicating communities indicates that it may have been more regular in some than in others, particularly provincial capitals. We are impelled - as far as our

¹⁸ **Lepti Minus** -dedication to Minicia Paetina, wife of Q. Iulius Cordinus C. Rutilius Gallicus, leg. Aug. pro pr. (ad census accipiendos in Africa) - C5.6990, Taurini.

Thabraca - dedication to Betutia Sertoriana, wife of L. Vitrasius Ennius Aequus, legate of his father L. Vitrasius Flamininus, proconsul of Africa - Eph. Ep. 8p. 136n. 532.

¹⁹ R. P. Saller, 'Personal Patronage under the Early Empire', Cambridge, 1982 p.175 reaches a similar conclusion for private clients of officials serving in Africa. 'The fact that very few of the inscriptions thank ex-governors for beneficial or merita after their tenure, suggests that though ex-officials often remained patroni in name, active exchange normally broke off when the official left his province'.

meagre evidence allows - to surmise that exceptional services rendered whilst in office account for the erection of many of these dedications, notwithstanding the failure to mention this on the stones, such reticence being almost compulsive on the part of dedications by council to patrons. The evidence for services rendered by patrons of group (A) after terminating their post is, therefore, necessarily negative.



Thamugadi - Dedication by the Numidian legate and patron of Thamugadi, L. Matuccius Fuscinus (A225).

Chapter IV Group (A) Patrons - Numidia

Paramount to any understanding of group (A), is the issue of whether or not co-optation of their members ever became automatic. One would hardly expect - nor does one find - evidence to indicate that such a concept was ever enshrined in law. Nevertheless, that some cities pragmatically opted to so diminish their civic independence, by permitting automatic co-optation in practice, is suggested by a considerable body of epigraphic evidence, in particular, that which relates to Numidia. F. Jacques has recently thrown the question open, however, by casting doubt on the automatic enrolment of Numidian legates as patrons ('*Le privilège de liberté*', Paris, 1986, pp.683-4). Resolution of the matter in some detail, therefore, seems apposite. Epigraphy records 28 group (A) Numidian legates as patrons. Their clients are restricted to Numidia's six largest communities, which total 40 instances of patrocini in all. In descending order, the six client communities are, Thamugadi with 16 legates as patrons, Cuicul with 11, Cirta and Diana Veteranorum (see below) with 4, Verecunda with 3, and Lambaesis with 2 (see list (A)).

The only legate attested as patron outside of the six communities named above, is also the only group (C) legate known, P. Iulius Iunianus Martialianus (signo) Leontius (C2432-243b). Besides being patron of his patria (Thamugadi), Martialianus was also patron of Cirta and of neighbouring castellum Tidditanorum (c24 km. north-west). More patrons are known from Castellum Tidditanorum (B213a), and other small veteran communities dependent upon Cirta (Caldis - B213, Thibilis - B236 and 240, and Sigus - B252A), but none are administrators. It may be, therefore, that such satellite communities were considered part of an administrator's clientela by attribution, on his assumption of the patronate of the Cirtan confederacy, as a matter of bureaucratic tidiness. Individual pacts of patronage entered into by these communities would, on the other hand, be reserved for persons connected to them by birth, or - as in the case of Martialianus - by neighbouring origin¹. Some support for this view may

¹ See I A39 for Martialianus' known estates

be adduced by the fact that, notwithstanding the copious epigraphy for the numerous dependent communities within Cirta's vast territory, legates are otherwise documented only thrice, in two of these texts being described not as patron of the community where the text was erected, but of Cirta². There is also a parallel example for a curator rei publicae, described as patron of Cirta on a text from castellum Tidditanorum (A248).

Of Numidia's six principal communities where patronate is attested, Lambaesis presents special problems and its discussion is best reserved for last. The whole issue of the frequency of co-optation of legates in Numidia, has been clouded to a considerable degree by the failure to recognise the inherent problems associated with Lambaesian epigraphy in this regard. There has also been a notable failure by scholars to appreciate the fact that a legate's patrocinium was less likely to be mentioned in certain types of texts than in others, as can easily be substantiated from Numidian epigraphy. Indeed, the patronate of eight known legate - patrons fails to appear on 44 non-lacunary texts of varying types, and from every major client community except Cirta (see list D(b), and below). With the probable exception of the omission of patrocinium on statue bases erected by the ordo to administrators (see below), failure to record patrocinium on an inscription is no guarantee that such patrocinium did not exist.

Some 63 legates (including eight who are anonymous) are known for the period 100-268 (i.e. from the foundation of Thamugadi to the change in Numidia's command structure from legates to equestrian praesides and (later) consulares. Of these, only 33 are epigraphically attested in those five Numidian communities, where the co-optation of legates is recorded as being most prevalent. The remainder are known from texts found at Lambaesis (see below, pp.78 ff.), and/or from insignificant communities, and/or from roadsides and bridges between communities, and/or (a significant

² Patrons of Cirta are recorded at Arsacal (C6048=A238) and at Sigus (ILAlgII6518=A242). The remaining text from a Cirtan satellite to mention a legate, occurs at Tigisis (ILAlgII 6248). The legate, Q. Anicius Faustus, is already known as patron of Cirta (A238), and does not appear on the text (the dedication of an arch by a private benefactor) in any active rôle.

proportion) from outside the province of Numidia. Some of course, are also (or only) known from literary sources. Thus, almost half of the known number of legates (30/63) are irrelevant to the question of patronage in Numidia's five principal client communities.

The 33 legates that do concern us, are documented by some 59 occurrences in the five communities. None appear in all of the five communities, and only three occur in four.

The largest number (18) are recorded in only one community, with a further seven in two (see list F), and three in five. References to this distribution pattern appear at list D. Only five of the 33 legates are not attested as patron in any of the communities, 4 of whom are known from only one (PIR,A1070,C1182 M725 and S682) and the other, from two (PIR,P223). They represent, therefore, only c1/10 (6/59) of all occurrences of legates in the major client centres. Legates whose patronate is known for one or more of these five communities, but who are not described as patron on extant inscriptions from the others, total 11. For only two of these does non-mention of the patronate occur in more than one town (see A233 and 237, list F). It can be seen, therefore, that the total of all legates, whose patronate of the five major client communities fails to appear on extant texts, is well under the total of those legates whose patronate is so attested (16(5+11) cf. 28). The total of such occurrences - 19 (6+13) - is, in fact, only c1/2 of the total of recorded patrocina (40).

Two communities in particular, Thamugadi and Cuicul, where legate-patrons are most densely recorded, indicate high ratios of legates attested as patrons, compared to those epigraphically attested there, but not as patrons (17/20 and 11/14 respectively). The ratios for the three remaining communities are, in numerical order, 4/6 for Diana Veteranorum, 5/9 for Cirta, and a low 3/10 for Verecunda. Detailed examination of the nature of the texts where patronate is unrecorded will, however, discount the suggestion from these figures, that legates tended to be co-opted more frequently in some of the five towns than others. This examination (see below pp. 72 ff.) will also invalidate the chronological pattern drawn up on list(D), based on the epigraphic

evidence from the five major client communities. This pattern presents a steady regnal increase in the number of legate-patrons during the second century, culminating in Marcus, followed by a steep decline to Hadrianic levels under Commodus and Severus, and under Severus' third century successors (up till 268). An almost duplicate pattern - equally erroneous - appears when the percentages per dating block of legate-patrons to legates epigraphically recorded, but not as patrons, is compared.

Of the 44 established examples of inscriptions omitting the patrocinium of eight known legate - patrons (see list E(b)), the most commonly attested type - and indeed the most prolific type on which all legates are recorded - involves official dedications or authorisations, of building works and statues. Some 23 texts involving five patrons are concerned, i.e. 52.27% of the 44 texts cited (see list E(b) n.5-9). The monuments dedicated or authorised, comprise those erected both by the ordo (eight texts), and by private benefactors (three texts), but also those erected privately, either by groups of officers or military units (eight texts) or official constructions erected 'per legionem III Aug.' (four texts)³. Texts of this type, where the legate's patronate is mentioned, occur extremely frequently, where the donor is the ordo (17 patrons on 40 (or possibly 49) texts), and occasionally, where the donor is a private benefactor (three patrons on three texts). For a further seven patrons on eight texts, the donor is unknown, but is probably the ordo (see list E(a) for these figures). No examples exist, however, for constructions erected through the legion, or for monuments privately erected by various military groups (the latter - naturally enough - are not attested outside of Lambaesis). It was evidently deemed inapposite - or irrelevant - to mention the legate's civilian function as patron in a context involving only himself and the military. Excluding those inscriptions in which either the military or an unknown donor was responsible for the construction, the following comparison can be made between texts on which the legate appears as dedicand. Where the legate is described

³ In two cases, it is unclear who is responsible for the text (list (D) n.8 = C18075 and BACTH (1918) p.85 n.1).

as patron, 17 legates on 43 texts are concerned⁴, representing 17/29 or (58.62%) of all known legate - patrons, and 43/71 (or 60.56%) of the total of texts on which they appear.

Where the legate is not described as patron, but is known from other texts to have been so, the number of legates and texts concerned is 6 and 11, representing respectively 6/8, or 75%, of all legate - patrons not so described, although only 11/44, or 25%, of the total of texts on which they appear. The number of legates and texts in this latter group form a low proportion of the former - 6/17 (or 35.29%) and 11/43 (or 25.58%) respectively. Their number is sufficient, however, to dispel any confidence that legates appearing in similar texts, whose patronate is neither described on these, nor known from other texts from the same community, were not patrons. Four legates, known from a total of 5 texts within Numidia's major client communities, are of this type⁵. The other type of dedication on which legates frequently appear, viz. those erected 'per legionem III Aug.', or through groups of soldiers or N.C.O's in a private capacity, where municipal patronate is never mentioned, can obviously not qualify at all as evidence for non-co-optation⁶.

The second most frequent epigraphic type where omission of patronate can be verified is that where dedications are erected to a legate or to members of his family by private clients. Sixteen examples, from three of the five major client communities are known, whilst no legates at all appear as patrons on such dedications. Mention of the honorands' municipal patronate on dedications to them by private clients is known from only five African inscriptions (ILA568, ILAlgII630, 614, C8934 and 9368), the

⁴ 17 legates. There are 17 and not 20, as the 3 legates who dedicated private benefactions also appear among those dedicating monuments erected by the ordo.

43 texts. i.e. 40 concerning the ordo, and 3 private benefactors.

⁵ A233-3a = AE(1934) 40 (Thamugadi), = C4212 (Verecunda)

A231=ILAlgII684 (Cirta)

A217-217a = AE (1930) 39 (Diana)

A220-220a = C4199 (Verecunda)

Probably in this category fall the public works completed 'ex auctoritate (legati)' at Cirta (A226-226b = ILAlgII631). No inscriptions, where the legate is mentioned 'ex auctoritate' or 'permissu', describe him as municipal patron.

⁶ Two legates from four texts already known as patrons of communities do not appear as patrons on texts from the same communities erected 'per leg. III Aug.' Another probable example (not included because the text breaks off where the legates' patronate might have appeared) occurs at Thamugadi (A225 = BACTH (1932-3) pp.307-8 n.12). For two dedications to a legate at Thamugadi, who is not attested as patron there, see n.21 below.

honorand in no instance being an administrator (B38,219,232,274,295). Where such dedications honour legates in towns not known to have been client - communities (e.g. AE (1934) 26 and (probably) C4233), it is clear that they are inadmissible as evidence of non-co-optation.

Reviewing the major client communities in order, there are for Thamugadi, three legates (from five texts), who are not described as patrons, nor known as patrons here from other inscriptions. For Cuicul, the number is also three (from four texts), for Diana two (from two texts), for Verecunda, a high 7 (from eight texts), and finally, for Cirta, four (from five texts). In all, there are 19 examples of unmentioned patrocinia from 25 texts.

All five inscriptions from Thamugadi can be discounted, as they are all of the official dedication type. (One, interestingly, may even record the deduction of Thamugadi - C17892)⁷. Moreover, one of the three legates (already known as patron of Cuicul (A211)) may have had his patronate of Thamugadi inscribed on the text which refers to him, if Mlle. Doisy's completion of a long lacuna at the end of the text is correct (MEFR, 65 (1953) pp.114-5).

The four texts from Cuicul are all quite different. One (C8327) is a fragmentary inscription on a statue base erected to a legate, but the dedicator is unknown. The expression 'praesidi exempli [rari? or rarissimi?]' would suit either the ordo or (more probably) a private client, and the lacuna presumably mentioned his patronage of one or the other⁸. Two others can quickly be dismissed, their context being unsuited for mention of patronate (an example of each is known from the 44 established omissions of patrocinia on list E(b)). One (AE (1920)30), is an ex-voto by a legate who was a native of Thamugadi, and a patron both there, and in two other communities (C243). The other, is mentioned only as a point of detail in the cursus of a beneficiarius, whose commanding officer the legate was (AE (1916)29). The same person, Ti. Claudius

⁷ Two other texts concerning the same individual were erected 'per legionem III Aug.', and similarly have no bearing on his co-optation (C17842, 17843).

⁸ Legates are rarely described as praesides on honorific dedications by the ordo, but are frequently so described by private clients. (See IA38 and cf. C2749, AE (1915) 16 and (1917-8)51 for dedications by clients to legates at Lambaesis to a 'praesidi rarissimo').

Subatianus Proculus, appears on another inscription from Cuicul (AE (1911)107), in which the senate erect a statue to his daughters. Fortunately, two other dedications survive to the family members of a legate-patron, which fail to refer to the legate's patronate (C4228-9, to the sons of M. Aemilius Macer Saturninus (A230) at Verecunda). Both dedications are, however, brief and straightforward, whereas that from Cuicul not only devotes considerable space to the legate's cursus, but declares that the senate set up the inscription 'ob insignem eius in patriam suam praestantiam'. Omission of patrocinium in brief texts like those from Verecunda might be explained as an oversight (although six other equally brief texts to a legate's wife or children do specify that the legate was patron)⁹, but how explain the omission of Subatianus' patronate in the generously inscribed stone from Cuicul? As it happens, there are good circumstantial reasons for expecting a reference to Subatianus' patronate. Subatianus was a citizen of Cuicul, and as such, we may well believe that his administration was one rich in benefits to his patria, and justified the mention of praestantia, which occasioned the dedication to his daughters. There is a parallel in the legate P. Iulius Iunianus Martialianus (signo) Leontius, who is known to have been patronus patriae in Thamugadi some 20 years later (C243a). The late C2 - early C3 (our text dates to 208-10) is also a relatively well-documented period for legate-patrons at Cuicul, with two known under Commodus, and another two under Severus (A233, 234, 237, 238c). In fact, the most likely solution for the non-mention of patrocinium on both the prolix dedication to Subatianus' daughters, and the curt inscriptions erected to Saturninus' sons, is that this detail appeared on a second statue base, erected to the legate himself at the same time. Although only two clear instances survive from Numidia of dedications erected in tandem by the ordo to a legate and to members of his family (and the legate's patronate is mentioned in all four texts), it seems a reasonable supposition that this was normal practice¹⁰. This seems borne out by simultaneous

⁹ AE (1933) 69 (A226a), C4232 (A226b), AE (1911) 103, AE (1916) 30, AE (1916) 31 (A231), C8326 (A234).

¹⁰ A226a (C4599 and AE (1933) 69); C243a and 244 (C2392 and Attidi III congr. epigr. Roma (1959) p.236).

dedications to legates and their family by private clients¹¹, as well as by the numerous joint dedications to local senators, equestrians and municipal worthies and their families by the *ordo*. It is just such a series of joint dedications from Thugga (erected by the 'pagus et civitas Thuggensis', to a flamen, to his father, and to his brother), that illustrate perfectly, how omission of *patrocinium* on one statue could be remedied by its inclusion on another (C26609, 26605, 26604). As with the statue base to Subatianus' daughters, no mention of the flamen's patronate appears on the bases to his father and his son, yet is given immediately after his name on the dedication to himself. We know that the bases were erected simultaneously by the repetition on each text firstly of the names of the four *curatores*, and secondly of 'ob munificentiam' (referring to the flamen), to which we may compare the 'ob...praestantiam' in the dedication from Cuicul. In conclusion, Subatianus' patronage of his patria is highly probable, if not provable, and we may take all such similar dedications to administrators' wives and children by African *ordines*, as a probable clue to the administrators' co-optation by the dedicating *ordo*.

Looking now at the two legates not attested as patrons in *Diana Veteranorum*, whose names appear on three texts, neither need detain us long. One appears on an official dedication (AE (1930) 39), and the other on a statue base erected to him by a private client (AE(1934)26). An alleged third example (see A233a) has been eliminated after analysis of the text (see below).

Five of the seven legates whose *patrocinium* is nowhere referred to on six texts from *Verecunda*, can be disregarded, their names all appearing on official dedications. (C4199, 4195, 4192, 4211, 4212 and *Ant. Af.*, 2 (1968) 216n.3). Lacunae in the last two texts may have included mention of the legate's patronate, and S. Tournenc believes this to have been the case with one of them (*Ant. Af.*, 2 (1968) 216n.3). A lacuna in another text, may once again have described the legate referred to, as patron (C4233). He is described as *avus* of two *clarissimi pueri patroni*. The text, which

¹¹ See catalogue 'Personal Patrocinia'; *Diana Veteranorum* (n.6 and 7), *Lambaesis* (n.34 and 35), *Thamugadi* (n.56 and 57).

breaks off in the middle of the legate's name, does not reveal the dedicator. Finally, another legate is mentioned in a dedication by the senate to his wife (C4234). As we have seen from two other dedications at Verecunda to members of a legate's family, no inference can be gained that the legate concerned was not patron, but rather the opposite.

All four legates who appear on six texts from Cirta and her confederacies, and who are not referred to as patrons, can be dismissed, the texts in five cases being official dedications or similar types (ILAlg II 631, 557, 684, 393 and C8208) and in another (ILAlg II 530), what appears to be an 'ex voto'. Lacunae mark two of these (ILAlg II 557 and 393), and could conceal a reference to the legate's patrociniū. The last of these has the letter 'p' immediately following mention of the command '[leg. Augustoru]m pr. pr.' Gsell suggests 'p[er....]', but 'p[atronus]' seems equally feasible.

In summation, none of the epigraphic evidence so far examined can be adduced as firm proof that the senates in Numidia's major client communities ever made a conscious choice not to co-opt a legate as patron. The evidence on which Jacques has drawn to discard the notion 'que le légat était systématiquement nommé patron par les cités numides' (loc. cit., p.683) primarily reduces itself to one text. The inscription is a very well known dedication by the ordo of Diana Veteranorum to the legate M. Valerius Maximianus, a native of Poetovio, whose long and varied career is inscribed down to the finest detail (AE (1956) 124). It is this, as much as anything, that makes the text's omission of his patronate of Diana so surprising. To cite Jacques again, 'Comment penser que le patronat eût été omis alors que les dédicants avaient même indiqué son pontificat à Poetovio, en Pannonie?' In fact, the detail of his pontificate was not - at least in its holder's view - a minor point, since we find it repeated in another text from Diana, erected to him this time by two clients, the Aquilii, in which the only other posts given are those he currently held as legate and consul designate

(C4600)^{11a}. More instructive, is the fact that of the 16 known inscriptions on statue bases set up by local senates to legates and praesides in Numidia, only this inscription from Diana fails to mention that the recipient was also patron. Some communities elsewhere in Africa did erect statues to their administrators, without making any reference to their patronage¹², but as with our text from Diana, no supporting texts can be adduced to show that such co-optation ever took place. Statues of this type can therefore probably be construed as evidence against the likelihood that their recipient ever enjoyed patronal rights over the community which erected them.

If this is correct, and Diana chose not to co-opt Maximianus as patron, but elected to flatter him with a statue instead, some of the other Numidian communities for whom few patrons are known (e.g. Verecunda), or at least few who were administrators (e.g. Cirta), may have followed suit in co-opting patrons at their own discretion. One would expect, however, in this case, that at least some honorific statues to legates erected by the *ordo* of those communities would have survived specifically excluding mention of the honorand's patronate. We may add, that even if it can be shown that one or more Numidian community elected not to choose each successive governor as patron, this need not be taken as a blueprint for the behaviour of all. The very high ratios of known patrons to known legates recorded for Thamugadi and Cuicul, and the high incidence of early co-optation in a legate's term of administration, should caution us against this.

However, there are good reasons for believing that the statue base to Maximianus did describe him as patron after all. Aside from the deliberate erasure of Commodus' name, the long text is blemished by only two small lacunae. That in the centre of the final line has been expanded thus by Pflaum ('*L'Afrique romaine*', Paris, 1978, p.66): 'splendidissimus ordo Dian[ensium Veteran.] aere conlato'. An alternative reading,

^{11a} His wife was similarly honoured by the Aquilii, magistrates at Diana (AE (1933)70). Warmington (p.44 n.192), Engesser (p.94) and J. Sasel (Tituli V p.568) erroneously attribute the patronage of Diana to the couple, on the basis of these texts. As Pflaum ('*L'Afrique romaine*', Paris, 1978, p.83) and Saller ('*Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*', Cambridge, 1982, p.199 n.52) correctly note, the patronate mentioned concerns only the two Aquilii brothers. Harmand adds his own idiosyncratic confusion to the picture, by describing Maximianus as both patron of Diana (p.193) and of Aquileia in Italy (p.227).

¹² 1-3, 5-6a, 9, 11-15, 18, 21(=NC19), NC 4, 7, 8, 10, 16-17, 19(=NA21), 20, 20A, 22.

abbreviating the name of Diana, should in fact be preferred, as none of the 21 other inscriptions which give the name of the town, ever add the descriptive term *Veteranorum*, which is only attested in the *itinerarium Antonini* (cf. CIL8p.462). There is, therefore, room to add the critical word 'patrono' which the text so evidently (on comparative analysis) requires. The revised reading can be paralleled by a similar text from Diana (C4599) which reads: 'patrono municipii ordo Dian. aere conlato', while another from Calama shows that the word order could be reversed: (C5363) : 'Calamenses patrono aere conlato'¹³. The addition of 'veteran (orum)' would be novel, whilst the omission of 'patrono' would be equally novel in the context. The simple solution of replacing the former with the latter (a word of equal length) rids us of two anomalies, simultaneously clearing the principal obstruction to the vista of an unbroken succession of patron-legates in Numidia's five major client communities. Maximianus, already known as patron of Cuicul, is thus secured as patron of Diana, and we may anticipate that he was also patron of Verecunda, a statue erected in the forum there by the ordo to his wife being most probably accompanied by another honouring him (C4234)¹⁴. Finally, we may add that a text from Thamugadi, in which Maximianus is described supervising swamp drainage (AE (1934)40), and which also fails to mention *patrocinium*, is of the official dedication type, for which we have already seen two examples of omitted *patrocinia* for legates, who are elsewhere verified as patrons.

From the foregoing it has been established that texts omitting a legate's *patrocinium* fall into two categories. The largest number (44) concern legates whose patronate of the community involved is attested from other inscriptions, while the remainder (24), concern those for whom no such supporting evidence exists. Almost half the total of the first category (21), however, derives from inscriptions referring to two individuals from Lambaesis, a community deliberately excluded from calculations (see above) for

¹³ cf. also C14291: 'patrono Thibiucenses aere conlato' and AE (1971) 510 : 'splendidissimus ordo coloniae Cuiculitanae patrono'.

¹⁴ Maximianus also appears on a dedication to *divus Commodus* from Verecunda. The text is too brief to speculate upon inclusion of patronage (C4212).

the second category. Removal of this group makes the figures for omissions of attested and non-attested patrocinia roughly equivalent, and comparative figures for the towns involved (except Cirta, which does not register in the former category) ^{are} ~~is~~ likewise roughly the same.

Table (A)
The Distribution of Texts Not Mentioning
The Patrocinia of Legates

Town	Patronate attested from other texts		Patronate nowhere attested	
	Legates	Texts	Legates	Texts
Thamugadi	4	7	3	5
Cuicul	3	3	3	4
Cirta	-	-	4	6
Diana	2	4	2	2
Verecunda	2	9	7	8
Total	7	23	15	25

N.B. The total of legates is diminished by four in each instance to allow for their appearance in more than one town.

In both categories, the inscription type most frequently omitting reference to patrocinium is the official dedication type, 14 for the former (subtracting 10 Lambaesian texts) and 16 for the latter. Two texts are known for both groups of dedications by the ordo to a member of legate's family. Dedications by clients are represented by both groups, though more frequently in the former (6 - subtracting 10 Lambaesian texts - as opposed to only two).¹⁵ The remaining inscription types are few, and none are of a nature suitable for mention of patrocinium.¹⁶ This overall

¹⁵ Including C4233 (cited above p.73) as another probable instance.

¹⁶ These are, for legates attested on other texts as patrons (1) a dedication by the legate to a freedwoman (C243a = C2428) and (2) (but only in Lambaesis) an ex voto erected by the legate (A246=C2589). For legates not known from other texts in the same town as patron, these are (1) the mention of the legate in the

similarity is important, because it greatly mitigates the relatively low yield of legate - patrons from Cirta, Diana and Verecunda, which might suggest a different approach to co-optation from that adopted at Thamugadi and Cuicul. Despite the far higher totals from Thamugadi and Cuicul (and a higher ratio of inscriptions relating to legates mentioning their patronate - see list B), there is nothing radically different in the types of inscriptions omitting patrociniūm from one community to the next. This is so, even of Cirta, where no examples of omitted patrociniā can be established for legates corroborated elsewhere as being patrons of Cirta. Verecunda, interestingly, which has the highest discrepancy between attested and non-attested patrons, has also a large number (equalled only by Thamugadi in Numidia's five major client communities) of inscriptions omitting the patrociniūm of bona fide patrons. The tendency of the evidence is, therefore, supportive of similar attitudes and practices among the five major client communities, in their co-optation of legates.

Even if we take the texts omitting mention of a legate's patronage at their face value, and assume that these individuals were not patrons, this leaves a frequency rate of co-optation of nearly 80% for Cuicul, and 85% for Thamugadi (see list B). In these circumstances, it is difficult to envisage how these communities could exercise their discretionary powers, and withhold enrolment of this or that legate as patron, without causing the greatest offence. Such freedom of discretion can surely only ever have applied in those communities where the honour was more sparingly granted to administrators (as apparently in Africa Proconsularis). No *tabulae patronatus* are known for Numidian legates which might inform us of the precise date of their co-optation, but there are several clear instances that this occurred early in their administration (within the first year).¹⁷ It is possible, that, in the matter of co-opting legates, Numidia's five major client communities indulged their spirit of civic independence, only in determining the timing of the actual co-optation. More

cursus of a beneficiarius (PIR, S682 = AE(1916) 29) and (2) ex votos erected by the legate (C243-243b = AE (1920) 30 and A209 = ILAlg II 530).

¹⁷ Legates attested as patrons in the first year of their administration - A209, 210, 218, 221, 226, 228?, 230, 233, 233a, 237, 238, 238a, 238b.

probably, the examples of early concession of patronage indicate that legates were routinely co-opted within a certain period, and are thus symptomatic of how lightly such contracts were entered into.

The situation in Lambaesis, as has already been mentioned, appears to be anomalous to that of Numidia's five other major client communities, although the evidence admits some difficulty of interpretation. With over 1400 known inscriptions, Lambaesis is easily the best documented Numidian community. There is, unfortunately, nothing like a corresponding survival of texts relating to patrons. Over 70% of Numidia's known legates (46/63) appear on 151 texts from Lambaesis, yet only two of these (or 4.44%) from four texts (a mere 2.65% of the total) are known as patrons. The insignificance of such percentages appears the more extreme, when compared with Thamugadi, 20 km. to the east, whence derives Numidia's second highest yield of texts referring to legates. Although Thamugadi has less than half the number of legates (20) known for Lambaesis, all but three (or 85% of them) have their patronate recorded (see list B). 58 texts in all refer to legates in Thamugadi (scarcely more than a third of the total for Lambaesis), yet in all, 36 (and possibly 45)¹⁸ describe those concerned as patrons (62.07%). Of the remaining 22, 17 refer to individuals whose patronate of Thamugadi is elsewhere attested (29.31%), and for nine of these, patronate has been posited in textual lacunae by analogy with comparable texts¹⁹. There remain only five texts, which refer to legates whose patronate of Thamugadi is unattested, a mere 8.62%. The contrast could hardly be more dramatic, but as we shall see, the reason lies in the nature of the Lambaesian material, differing as it does in one essential element from the epigraphy of Thamugadi, and that of the four other major Numidian client communities.

In the case of the latter, the majority of texts for which legate-patrons are known, were erected by the authority of the communities concerned, usually expressed by the formula 'decreto d(ecurionum) p(ecuniae) p(ublicae)'. Of the 71 inscriptions attesting

¹⁸ For the nine potential additions, see list (D), Thamugadi, footnote to (a) 2.

¹⁹ 17 texts to known patrons: for nine of these see note above, for another three, BACTH (1932-3) 307-8n.12) see n.6, for the remaining 7 see list D, Thamugadi (b).

such patronage, 58 indicate that one or other of the 5 communities authorised their erection, whilst another nine marred by lacunae probably did so.²⁰ In two of the four remaining texts, the legate dedicates buildings erected at the private expense of two flamines (AE (1968) 647, AE (1925) 23-24), whilst in the other two (also dedicated by the legate) the authority of the community is absent, and it is unclear if public expense was involved (AE(1930) 40, (1985)880b).

In Lambaesis, however, only seven of the 151 inscriptions on which legates appear make any reference at all to the Lambaesan ordo, and in three of these the legate is described as patron (A238a = C18256, BACTH (1918) 85 n.3, A246 = C2611). The remaining four are all of a type where mention of patronate has been seen to have been arbitrary. Three (concerning two legates) are official dedications by the legate of a publicly erected monument (A230 = AE(1914)39, (1967) 565, A233 = C2598), the other, an epigraphic type unique to Lambaesis, but known from eight other Numidian examples, viz. a dedication by the ordo to a member of the legate's family (A226 = C2740). There are only five other instances of inscriptions from Lambaesis conforming to a type known to document the patronate of legates. One text mentions that the legate was patron (A238a=AE(1911)99), and four do not (A220=C18214, 18234, A237=AE(1964)196, PIR,C878=AE(1913)11). All the texts are official dedications by the legate of benefactions provided by local bourgeoisie (flamines and possessores). A parallel exists from Diana Veteranorum for the omission of patronate in dedications of benefactions (A226a=C4582)²¹. Arbitrary omission is, therefore, also plausible for all eight of the twelve Lambaesan texts cited, which fail to describe the legate as patron - six legates in all being concerned (A220, 226, 230, 233, 237 and PIR,C878).

²⁰ The nine texts marred by lacunae, but probably erected by municipal authority are C17894=A220, AE(1985) 876c=A221, AE (1985) 878 = A227a, BACTH (1915) 124n1 = A230a, AE (1985) 880a = A230b, BACTH (1916) 232-3n.4=A238c, C2367=A239, BACTH (1915) 134n.24=A254, C17820=A255.

²¹ Patrocinium is also omitted for two known legate - patrons, who appear in an official capacity on two other private benefactions. The legates do not dedicate the two texts concerned, but authorise them ('ex decreto' or 'permisso') - see list E(b)9. Authorisations of this sort provide no instances where patrocinium is mentioned.

There remain 139 Lambaesian texts of the 151 on which legates occur. 128 of these are of a type not known to have attested a legate's patronate, either here or elsewhere in the province. Eleven others are fragmentary texts; in six instances, honorific statues erected to legates by unknown dedicands; in the remaining five texts, of a type too fragmentary to define (see n.17 and 18, list D, Lambaesis, (c)3). 110 of the 128 Lambaesian texts which can be categorised, fall into four types, where the mention of patronate has been seen to have been arbitrary, and in fact, 19 of the 110 concern the two legates whose patronate at Lambaesis is known. The table below lists the four types and the relative frequency of their occurrence in Lambaesis, according to whether they are known as patrons there or not. Comparison is also made with the aggregate of texts of the four types from Numidia's five other major client-communities. References to the inscriptions concerned appear in list D under the appropriate community and heading.

Table (B) Inscription Types Not Mentioning a Legate's Patrocinia

INSCRIPTION TYPES	LAMBAESIS			5 MAJOR NUMIDIAN CLIENT COMMUNITIES		
	Legates known as patron	Legates not known as patron	Total	Legates known as patron	Legates not known as Patron	Total
(1) Statue to legate (or a family member) by a client	1 (10)	20 (36)	21 (46)	3 (6)	1 (2)	4 (7)
(2) Legate erects an ex-voto	1 (1)	18 (24)	19 (25)	-	2 (2)	2 (2)
(3) Legate dedicates a monument erected by members of the military	1 (8)	9 (19)	10 (27)	-	-	-
(4) Legate dedicates a monument erected 'per legionem'	-	9 (12)	9 (12)	1 (4)	1 (2)	2 (6)
TOTAL	2 (19)	38 (91)	40 (110)	4 (10)	4 (5)	8 (15)

NB. Bracketed numbers indicate the total of texts. Due to numerous instances of legates appearing in more than one community the totals for legates seldom correspond to the total of unbracketed figures in each column.

The four types of texts are arranged in decreasing order, according to the number of texts from Lambaesis mentioning legates not known as patron here. The first and largest group (statues erected by clients) is also the group most represented by legates whose patronate is attested from other inscriptions. This is true, not only for Lambaesis, where the total is 10, but for the other major client communities, where six examples are attested. The failure of such texts to mention patronage applies not only to legates, but to all administrators in Africa, and only five municipal patrons in Africa of any sort are so attested (see above p.33). For the second largest group (ex-votos erected by the legate) there is only one comparable example of a known legate-patron (from Lambaesis). Nevertheless, the failure to denote the title of patron on ex-votos was clearly a general phenomenon. Not one municipal patron in Africa is known from such a source. Inscriptions of a similar nature, benefactions recorded by benefactors, rarely concern administrators (although the commemoration of three aedes by Numidian legates, which I have entered as ex-votos, are of a borderline type)²² and only once does the administrator in question describe himself as patron. The administrator in this instance (C297) was, however, both a local, and a mere curator rei publicae, at a date when the office had become indistinguishable from other local munera held by local bourgeoisie. The third and fourth groups concern the legate in a context involving the military, acting either in a private or official capacity, and the failure of such texts to mention the legate's civilian function is unsurprising (see above p.68). That such omissions were the norm, may be deduced from the fact that eight texts from the third group (all from Lambaesis), and four from the fourth (all from outside Lambaesis), all refer to legates, whose patronate can be confirmed from other texts. In summation, from the intrinsic nature of the four epigraphic types - none of which directly concern the ordo - and the fact that, while none attest the patronate of legates, 26 known omissions of patronate can be documented (19 from Lambaesis, and 10 from the other principal client-communities in Numidia - see table (B) above),

²² See list D, Lambaesis, (c)5, for references.

it is emphatically clear that no construction of non-co-optation can be placed on the failure of the 91 Lambaesian texts from these four types to mention patronate.

There remain only 18 Lambaesian texts not so far discussed, which document legates but not their patronate. Two refer to a legate, already known as patron, and can be dismissed (see list D, Lambaesis, (b) 5-6, for the inscription types and^d references). The other 16 comprise a miscellany of seven epigraphic types, none providing a context congenial to the mention of patronate. Recitation of the types concerned, without further comment, will suffice to make this clear (references appear in list D, Lambaesis, (c) 8-9, 12-16). Three concern the legate in an active rôle, dedicating a monument erected by the emperor (four texts), or persons unknown (four texts), and ordering a monument's restoration (one text). Seven texts remain, where the legates rôle is passive. In two texts he merits a mention in Hadrian's adlocutio; in another, he is recipient of an official request from a procurator; in two others, citizens include the wish 'pro salute (legati)' on their dedications; and in the remaining two, the legate merely appears to define a soldier's cursus.

We have seen that the small yield of legates as patrons in Lambaesis (2) is directly attributable to the paucity of texts mentioning the Lambaesian community and the legate in conjunction (7), or otherwise conforming to a type, where patronate may be provided (5). Of these 12 texts, four relate to patrons, eight do not, but all of the latter are also of a type where parallels for arbitrary omission of the patronate can be documented. The great majority of the remaining legates, epigraphically attested at Lambaesis, but not as patrons, do not appear on texts congenial to mention of the patronate. Although so few Lambaesian texts reveal the interrelationship between legates and the Lambaesian senate or its office holders, we may imagine that the legate's intercession in Lambaesian municipal life was felt every bit as keenly here, as elsewhere in the province, if not indeed more so, given the topographic merging of castra and town²³.

²³ On the complex urban structure of Lambaesis, cf. M. Janon, 'Recherches à Lambèse', *Ant. Af.*, 7 (1973) pp.215-21, who rejects the notion of a geographical division between castra and civitas (*ibid.*, p.220). The poor state of preservation of Lambaesis, has, for instance, meant that the location of the forum is unknown (*ibid.* pp.217-8), a site, as we have seen, favoured for erecting statues to prominent citizens and officials, of whom a high proportion were, or had been, patrons.

There is no need, therefore (contra E. Fentress),²⁴ to explain the absence of legates as patrons in Lambaesis, with the notion that being most under the legate's direct control, the legate's patronage might be taken for granted, in contrast to Thamugadi (where most legates are recorded as patrons) which felt obliged 'to make a certain effort to attract his goodwill'. The differing nature of the epigraphic evidence apart, Thamugadi was, at only 20 km. distance, scarcely far from the legate's purview.

Our paucity of evidence for the Lambaesian ordo and townspeople is not only restricted to those inscriptions, on which the legate appears, but is a regrettable fact of Lambaesian epigraphy in general. Only another nine texts erected or authorised by the Lambaesian senate, for instance, are known for our period (100-268), four of which are perfunctory dedications to deities, and two, indiscernible fragments (C2592, 2594, 2617, 18226, 3309, 18346). The three others comprise a text granting the space for a statue by the formula *l.d.d.d* (C2677); a briefly inscribed statue to an emperor erected by the ordo (C2695); and finally, a text, in which the ordo acts as executor of a *fideicomisum* (C18227). The legate's dedication was unessential in the context of any of these nine inscriptions, and its absence should, therefore, fail to surprise. Thus, notwithstanding the minimal evidence which survives from so large a corpus of Lambaesian epigraphy, it is perfectly conceivable that the co-optation of patrons here was every bit as regular as appears to have been the case elsewhere in the province's major centres, the regrettable fact being, that so little of what is extant is of a type in which patronage is normally mentioned.

We may perhaps digress at this juncture to mention four Lambaesian texts not so far described, which provide a rare glimpse of the close working relationship between the legate and the civilian community. The texts are not of a type which normally mention patronage of a community, and no examples are known at all for administrators in Africa²⁵. Two of the inscriptions, in fact, refer to a legate already attested as patron of

²⁴ E. Fentress, 'Numidia and the Roman Army, Social, Military and Economic Aspects of the Frontier Zone', BAR, int. ser. 53(1979)p.160.

²⁵ Two, however, are known for local senators in Numidia (B219-ILAlgII630, and B232-ILAlgII614). Both examples are from Cirta. See above p.33, for the failure of administrators to appear as patrons on dedications by private clients.

Lambaesis (A246), while the others concern legates for whom no Numidian client - communities are known (C2743,2734,2754, and AE(1917-8)73). The inscriptions are dedications by personal clients to legates, a type quite frequent in Lambaesis and elsewhere in Numidia, when the dedicands are staff officers or soldiers. In these instances, however, the dedicands are members of the municipal aristocracy²⁶. One (C2743) was erected by a pair of brothers, both *advocati*, to their 'patronus'; another (AE(1917-8)73), also to his 'patronus' by an equestrian *advocatus*, 'ob insignem eius erga se dignationem'; while the third (C2734), to the same legate (again called 'patronus'), was erected by three individuals, comprising yet another *advocatus* (again equestrian), as well as a *duumvir* and *flamen*. In the latter text, praise of the dedicand is quite specific - 'iu[dicia] eius for[i iustitiamque] tot[ies admiranti sunt]'. Finally, a fourth text (C2754) appears to have been erected to an anonymous legate at the behest of *duumviri quinquennales* (reading '[instantia(?) II viro (?)]rum qq.' in line 21)²⁷. It is clear from these texts, that in Lambaesis (at least for the third century, to which all these texts date), the legate's rôle as *iudex* was instrumental in the creation of bonds of personal patronage with advocates, and with numerous other municipal officials, who stood to benefit from his decisions. Dedications by municipal dignitaries to legates and their family in other assize centres in Numidia, make it clear that this was not a phenomenon restricted to Lambaesis²⁸. One advocate, in fact, who erected dedications to two legates, set up one in Lambaesis (AE (1917-8)73), and the other in Thamugadi (C2393)²⁹. The influence a legate could exert in his judicial capacity, and his oversight of the financial transactions and building constructions undertaken by the local senate, or by private individuals, were of course primary factors, not only in the establishment of bonds of personal patronage, but in co-optation by the communities principally affected. For now, it is sufficient to note that the Lambaesian evidence

²⁶ See 'Personal Patrocinia' n.17,20,33,52.

²⁷ See H.G. Pflaum, 'Les fastes de la province de Narbonnaise', Paris, 1978,p.39 ff. The text does not appear in B. Thomasson, 'Praesides provinciarum Africae'. Pflaum makes no suggestion for line 21; CIL VIII 1812 reads '[-IIvi]rum qq.'.

²⁸ See 'Personal Patrocinia' n.5,6,7 (Diana Veteranorum) 56,57,58 (Thamugadi).

²⁹ See 'Personal Patrocinia' n.17 and 58.

indicates the active intercession by legates in all these areas, thus differing in no wise from that of Numidia's other major centres, except in epigraphic volume.

One final aspect of the enrolment of Numidian legates as municipal patrons, not so far discussed, is the possibility that some communities initiated these compacts at a later date than others. In chronological order, the first attested legate - patrons in Numidian communities are Cirta (A207 - AD103-5), Thamugadi (A208 - AD109), Cuicul (A211 - AD 132-3), Diana (A220a - AD149), Verecunda (A226b-AD162), Lambaesis (A238a - AD197) and castellum Tidditanorum (A243b-AD227-30). The last community may be left aside from discussion, only one legate (C243b) - a Numidian - being recorded as patron here³⁰. Of the others, all but two - Cirta, Numidia's most ancient and populous city, and that with the earliest attested legate - patron (A207-AD103-5), and Cuicul - record legates at a date earlier than their first known legate - patrons. Three texts dating from the beginning of our period (AD100), make known the legate L. Munatius Gallus, founder of the colony of Thamugadi, none of which were erected, or authorised by the ordo. It is possible, then, that at Thamugadi the co-optation of legates did not commence until the municipal structures were more firmly established, A. Larcus Priscus being, perhaps, the first, in 109. A similar settling-in period may have elapsed in the case of Cuicul, a colony founded under either Nerva or (more probably) Trajan³¹. The first legate-patron is likely to antedate 132-3 (when the earliest is attested), but epigraphy for this period is scarce³². For Diana and Verecunda, both settled under the Flavians, but not made municipia until Trajan and Marcus³³ respectively, we lack any epigraphic evidence prior to Antoninus Pius. Even the evidence for this period is poor, and the few texts which antedate the first attestation of legate - patrons in these communities, offer no impediment to speculation that the pattern of co-optation commenced earlier, possibly contemporaneously with

³⁰ See commentary to IA39a.

³¹ cf. J. Gascou, 'La politique municipale de Rome en Afrique du Nord', ANRW 10, 2 pp.177-8, for a probable Trajanic dating.

³² Two statue bases, at least one (the earliest), erected by the ordo, are known for 107 (C8315) and 112-7 (C8316). Possibly Trajanic, is BACTH (1917) 288 n.4; possibly Hadrianic, is BACTH (1932-3) 472 n.6. Of uncertain Hadrianic date are C8317 and AE (1911) 109.

³³ cf. J. Gascou, *op.cit.*, pp.174-5 and p.200.

Thamugadi and Cuicul. The slow rise to municipal status by Verecunda (or for that matter Lambaesis, another municipium of Marcus) cannot, for instance, be adduced as evidence for the later development of co-optation here, since the town is still recorded as a vicus (cf. C4205) under the administration of its first known legate as patron in AD162. Only two inscriptions referring to legates in Diana and Verecunda antedate the earliest known legate - patrons (in 149 and 162 respectively), and both are of the official dedication type. That from Diana in 140 is earlier by nine years (AE (1930) 39). The text from Verecunda, in 148-9, is earlier by slightly more - 12-13 years (C4199). Official dedications by legates are, as we have seen, the commonest inscriptional type which fail to record the patrocinium of known legate - patrons, and this is particularly true of Verecunda, where seven examples are known, four of which were erected by the ordo (see list D, Verecunda, (b) 2-3). Besides these two texts, only one other inscription (a statue base to Pius, erected by the ordo in 141 - C4587) antedates the first attested patron in Diana, and none are known from Verecunda. The evidence against earlier co-optation of legate - patrons in both towns, therefore, rests on three texts, of limited value.

In Lambaesis, we know the name of the legate who first constructed the walls and original (eastern) camp ('muros et castra a solo fecit' - AE (1954)137) in AD81, and another 24 are known from early in the reign of Hadrian (AD121-3), before we arrive at our first attested legate-patron, the ubiquitous Q. Anicius Faustus in 197. However, as we have seen, only a handful (8) of these texts are of a type, to which mention of patronage is normally confined, and all these can be exemplified by identical inscription types in which the patrocinium of known patrons is omitted. Seven of the eight texts antedate Faustus. The earliest of the seven inscriptions (C18214 and 18234) date to 146-9, and the rest to 162 (C2740), 162-5 (AE (1964) 196), 172-3 (AE (1914) 39, (1967) 565) and 184 (C2698). Lambaesis was possibly still a vicus when its ordo erected a statue to the wife of the second earliest legate in our list, in 162³⁴.

³⁴ cf. AE (1964) 196, a later text, and J. Gascou, *op. cit.*, p.199 n.376. M. Janon, *op. cit.*, p.220, notes, however, that the word vicus is never unequivocally applied to Lambaesis, and that the expansion 'possessores i[m]munes vici' is arbitrary (cf. AE (1964) 196, and the comments of the editor H. Escurac -

The legate, D. Fonteius Frontinianus L. Stertininius Rufinus, the first attested patron of the vicus of neighbouring Verecunda (5 km. north-east), may, in fact, be, by inference, the first attested patron of Lambaesis, since as we have already observed, statues erected by the ordo to a legate's wife or children are a likely indication that the ordo conjointly erected a statue to the legate himself, on which mention of his patrocinium would be made. While the statue base to Fonteius' wife happens to be the first datable text from Lambaesis on which mention of the ordo or the citizenry is made, the total of such texts for our period (100-268) is small. The ordo probably predated this text by some considerable period, a fact which may be deduced, apart from anything else, from the willingness of Marcus to grant the town municipal status at this date, or soon afterwards. The co-optation of legates in Numidian towns, in Lambaesis, as well as better attested client communities, may, in conclusion, have been coeval, since nothing in the evidence unearthed to date stands to contradict it.

Doisy, 'Lambèse et les vétérans de la legio tertia Augusta', Mél. à A. Grenier, Bruxelles - Berchem (1962) pp.571-83).

Chapter V Group (A) Patrons - Africa Proconsularis

The evidence from Africa Proconsularis provides a far less satisfactory basis on which to assess the regularity or frequency of the co-optation of its administrators as patrons, than that which we have seen from Numidia. The considerable differences in the history and urbanisation of the two provinces naturally determined differences in the nature of the epigraphic material itself, but there appears also to have been a substantial difference between the two provinces' actual approach to co-optation.

Although Numidian legates are recorded from a number of sites in the province, only six communities attained or surpassed modest proportions, and only one of these, Cirta, had an established Roman presence prior to Domitian or Trajan¹. Inevitably, most of Numidia's epigraphy (and particularly that relating to legates) tends to be concentrated in these towns. All of the six towns attest the co-optation of legates as patrons, with a relative abundance of such attestation from two towns, Thamugadi and Cuicul. The evidence, as argued above, appears to support the contention that this co-optation was regular to the extent of being, perhaps, no more than a perfunctory formality. It is not difficult to comprehend how such a situation arose. Numidia was a 'young province', only Cirta of its large communities having, so far as can be ascertained, any pre-Roman civic traditions². It was, of course, also a 'frontier province', with the Roman element consisting primarily of serving soldiers and their officers, or veterans and their families and descendants. A strong feeling of allegiance to the chief administrator, who also happened to be the commanding officer of the army, was natural enough in these circumstances. The Roman presence was both small and isolated, in a terrain where forbidding mountains and expansive deserts made it a simple matter for hostile indigenous tribesmen to melt away after razzias or more ambitious assaults. Insularity, shared military experience, and the uncertainties of frontier existence, tightened the bond between veterans and the Third Augustan

¹ Included are the Cirtan dependant *coloniae* and *castella*.

² Cirta had been the capital of the Massylian kingdom from the end of the 3rd BC, and briefly formed the base of the vast domains bestowed by Caesar upon the condottiere, P. Sittius, before becoming an Augustan colony, between 36 and 27 BC.

legion's commander. There were, besides, not a few veterans whose children and relatives would be serving in the Numidian army at any given time. In these circumstances, co-optation of the legate as patron by Numidia's veteran communities was a natural response, and one which enabled them both to broadcast their continuing allegiance to the forces of law and order, and to advance wherever possible their own security and private concerns. That co-optation of legates in Numidia tended to become self-perpetuating, was inherent in the peculiar circumstances which led to the initial conferments of *patrocinia*, and these considerations remained largely unvitiated even in more settled and prosperous times.

In Africa *Proconsularis*, urbanisation was both profound and of long ancestry. The basic pattern of habitation was well established in Punic times, with a dense peppering of communities in the fertile heartland of the Bagradas - Miliana valleys, and with a number of large and prosperous maritime towns, north of the gulf of Gabes in eastern Tunisia and in Tripolitana. The years between the destruction of Carthage in 146BC and the death of Augustus in AD14, witnessed the confiscation and centuriation of African land on a grand scale, and with it, the gradual establishment of the fundamental Roman land-ownership pattern. It is a notorious fact that much of this land fell into the hands of a few Roman families, who largely ran their vast *latifundia* in *absentia*³. Smaller allotments were also assigned to veterans from the time of Marius, most, if not all, being either in, or near, pre-existing Punic communities. All but four of the 20 attested deductions of *coloniae* in Africa - the other four are Flavian and Trajanic - belong to the period between Caesar and Augustus⁴. To the same period can also be assigned the creation of three *municipia*. This by no means completes the list of towns subject in this early period to the infiltration and settlement

³ Pliny N.H. XVIII, 6, 35 'sex domini semissem Africae possidebant, cum interfecit eos Nero princeps'.

⁴ Caesar - Augustus:

(1)Curubis; (2)Clupea; (3)Neapolis; (4)Carpis; (5)Hippo Diarrhytus; (6)Thabraca; (7)Karthago; (8)Uthina; (9)Maxula; (10)Thuburbo Minus; (11)Simitthu; (12)Sicca Veneria; (13)Assuras; (14)Thuburnica : Caesar-Augustus(?); (15)Thub[-]; (16)colonia Canopitana (cf. J. Gascou, 'La politique municipale de Rome en Afrique du Nord', ANRW, 10, 2, p.141. For colonia Canopitana cf. ibid pp.186-7 and 187n.299e and cf. A. Beschtaouch, 'Éléments celtiques dans la population du pays de Carthage', CRAIBL (1979) pp.404-7); Flavian (17) Ammaedara; (18)Madauros:Trajanic; (19)Theveste; (20)Thelepte (cf. J. Gascou, op. cit., pp. 161-3, 171, 173-4).

of Italian veterans, negotiatores and possessores of a non-military background. From Pliny's list of oppida civium Romanorum can be added another nine towns, as his sources for Africa are Augustan, and are uncorrected, and the same author provides us with a further two towns, whose occupants must have included Italians, Uzalis, an oppidum Latinum, and castra Cornelia, an ^ppidum stipendiarium⁵. Besides these, may be mentioned Hadrumetum, described by Caesar as a conventus civium Romanorum; Thysdrus, where Caesar is known to have installed veterans; Thibaris, where veterans settled as early as Marius; Thuburbo Maius, whose epithet Iulia (ILA 268, ILT 719) according to Gascoü 'rapeller peut-être d'anciennes assignations viritanes de colons romains sur le territoire de la civitas de Thuburbo Maius'; and 15 pagi, of early, possibly Augustan, date⁶. Finally, another 19 oppida libera are listed by Pliny, many of which must have had enclaves of Italians within them.⁷

A total of some 50-70 communities in Africa Proconsularis can, therefore, be said to have experienced some degree of Italian occupation by the death of Augustus. Many others, of course, will have been engulfed by (or created as a result of) the extensive praedia of absentee Italian landlords. This high total is to be contrasted with Numidia, where as we have seen, only Cirta and its dependencies, colonised by Caesar's condottiere, Sittius, had a similar ancestry⁸. The physical beginnings of all five of

⁵ Pliny. N.H., V5. For the date of his sources cf. T.R.S. Broughton, 'The Romanization of Africa Proconsularis', New York (1968) p.49 n.9. The towns are Thunusida, Thibica, Chiniava, Uchi Maius, Vaga, Abutucense, Aboriense, Canopicum and Uchi Minus. (The last four are otherwise unattested.)

⁶ Hadrumetum - Caesar, B.A., 97. For another conventus c.R. at Mactaris 'au plus tard au début du II^e siècle et probablement beaucoup plus tôt', cf. J. Gascoü, op. cit., p.198.

Thysdrus - L. Teutsch, 'Die Städtewesen in Nordafrika in der Zeit von C. Gracchus bis zum Tode des Kaisers Augustus', Berlin 1962, p.85, cf. J. Gascoü, 'La politique municipale de l'empire romain en Afrique proconsulaire de Trajan à Septime-Sévère', Paris, 1972, pp.192-4 and P. Quoniam, 'À propos des 'communes doubles' et des 'Coloniae Juliae' de la province d'Afrique', Karthago, X, 1959-60, pp.78-9.

Thibaris - C26181. Other communities with veteran settlements of Marian date are Thuburnica (AE (1951)81) an Augustan colony, and Uchi Maius (C154450, 15454, 15455, 26270, 26275, 26281), one of Pliny's oppida civium Romanorum.

Thuburbo Maius - J. Gascoü, ANRW, 10, 2 pp. 142-3, cf. J. Gascoü, op. cit., 1972, p.25 and P. Quoniam, op. cit., pp.67-79.

15 pagi - Thugga, Agbia, Numluli, Sutunurca, Medeli, Thubursicu Bure, Thignica, Aversa, pagus Suttuensis, pagus Assalitanus, pagus Thac[-], pagus N[-], pagus Thunigabensis, pagus Trisipensis, Ksar Tir. 3 other pagi, Thibaris, Uchi Maius and Thuburbo Maius are mentioned above. For pagi, cf. J. Gascoü, op. cit., 1972, pp.172-87.

⁷ Pliny N.H., V 4-5, Tigisis, Aggar, Avitta (Bibba), Thapsus, Lepti Minus, Acholla, Theudalis, Bulla Regia, Thagaste, Thisica, Tunis, Zama, Matera, Vaga, Ulisippira, Melizita, Salaphita and a second Vaga. In Tripolitana, Lepcis Magna and Sabratha minted coins under Augustus, and may also have been civitates liberae (cf. C. Lepelletier, 'Les cités de l'Afrique romaine au bas empire', II, Paris 1981, pp. 335 and 372).

⁸ Besides the three confederate colonies of Chullu, Milev and Ruscade settled by the Sittiani, which at this period probably ranked only as pagi or castella (cf. J. Gascoü, 'Les magistratures de la Confédération

Numidia's largest towns (outside the Cirtan confederacy) fell under the purview of the legate, and successive commanders looked to these communities' welfare by providing security, by ensuring the defence and upkeep of communications, and by overseeing the construction of aqueducts and other facilities. In Africa Proconsularis, on the other hand, most communities had a long Punic heritage of civic traditions behind them, and several of them were occupied by Italians, either independently or at the behest of Marius and Caesar, rather than through the offices of the proconsul. Lacking that historical dependence on the provincial governor which bound the Numidian veteran settlements to the legate, meant that from the outset many communities in Africa Proconsularis were more likely to adopt a more flexible attitude to co-optation.

Another early factor tending in this direction occurred in AD39, when Caligula relieved the proconsul of Africa of his military command (one of the few actions of that emperor not revoked by his successors). Proconsular authority thereafter devolved principally upon their oversight of jurisdiction and of municipal affairs in general, the latter being an area in which governors continued to retain (and indeed augment) their already considerable discretionary powers⁹. After 39, one finds a few rare references to proconsular dedications of imperially funded projects¹⁰, but these cease altogether after the Flavians, no doubt in connection with a legal ban on this practice, first mentioned by the jurist Macer¹¹. Proconsular supervision of other imperially financed undertakings, such as the monumental rebuilding of Carthage and Lepcis Magna under Pius and Severus, remained just as real, however, even if proconsuls were denied the

Cirtéenne', BACTH, n.s. 17B (1981) pp.325-6, another 11 dependent pagi and castella are known by name (op. cit., p.325 n.18), some of which may have been Sittian foundations. Others, like the site Ksar Mahidjiba, also attributed to Cirta, will have been Octavian or Augustan settlements (cf. op. cit., p.324 = AE(1955) 202 = ILAlg II 4226, for the assignation of land to colonists at Ksar Mahidjiba in 26 BC).

⁹ cf. R.P. Saller, op. cit., p.154 'the opportunities for exercise of patronage were great, because there were no detailed rules regulating the relationship between cities and the governor'.

¹⁰ e.g. the aqueduct at Thysdrus, AD72-3 (L. Foucher, 'La maison de la procession dionysiaque à El Djem' Publications de l'Université de Tunis, 1^{re} série, XI Paris, 1963, p.29 ff.; the amphitheatre at Lepcis Magna, AD 56 AE(1968) 549).

¹¹ Dig. L10.3.4 (and cf.L10.4) cf. J. Kolendo, 'L'activité des proconsuls d'Afrique d'après les inscriptions', *Tituli* IV p.358, who does not make the distinction between dedications by the proconsul of imperially funded projects, on the one hand, and those erected by the municipalities themselves, or by private citizens, on the other. While the passage from Macer makes it clear that governors were not permitted in either case to have their name inscribed on the dedication, the available evidence suggests that in practice the law was waived when the responsibility for the construction was not imperial.

reflected glory of having their names appear on the dedicatory inscription. Ulpian also informs us that proconsuls were expected to visit and inspect municipal buildings and advise on their need for repair, and also to provide, where necessary, for the completion of unfinished constructions¹². However, if African proconsuls ever, like Pliny, recommended imperial financial aid for local building projects, there is scant African evidence of imperial revenues being thus spent. Instead, most of our evidence for Africa Proconsularis indicates that imperial monies disbursed in this province were confined to pet projects, often on an enormous scale (e.g. the Neronian and Gordian amphitheatres at Lepcis Magna and Thysdrus, the Antonine baths at Carthage and Severus' reconstruction of Lepcis Magna). There is obviously a great difference between this situation, where the conception and control of building projects was largely out of the proconsul's hand, and that in Numidia, where for strategic and pragmatic reasons, the legate's army was never allowed to be idle, and their construction of civic buildings, as well as the maintenance of roads and water supplies is very well documented. The legates were properly perceived as having a greater personal input in this activity, and their names commonly appear dedicating some building work 'per legionem III Aug.'.

Once command over the legion passed from the proconsul to the Numidian legate, communities in Africa Proconsularis were also deprived of an important means of establishing regular and continuous contact with successive proconsuls, viz. by the presence of their own citizens in the legion. Military lists from Numidia indicate the high proportion of Africans serving in the legion¹³, and numerous dedications to the legate, or to members of his family, survive, detailing the gratitude felt by young

¹² Dig. I, 16, 9, 1 (Ulpian, *de officio proconsulis* I) cf. G. P. Burton, 'Proconsuls, Assizes and the Administration of Justice under the Empire', *JRS*, XLV (1975) p.104.

¹³ e.g. all but three of the *beneficiarii*, *cornicularii*, *speculatores*, *commentarienses* and *quaestionarii* in C2586 are African. Of the 45 whose domicile is African, 21 are Numidian (11 from Lambaesis, five from Thamugadi, three from Cirta and its dependencies, one from Cuicul and another from Mascula). The date is AD203 - cf. also C18068, a list of veterans of AD198. All 84 whose domicile is given are African, 56 being Numidian. (26 from Lambaesis, 22 from Cirta, five from Thamugadi, two from Cuicul, and one from Diana). Note, however, that heavy reliance on African recruits did not commence until Hadrian (cf. G. Forni, 'Il reclutamento delle legioni da Augusto a Diocleziano', Milano-Roma, 1953, pp.220-1).

officers who benefitted from his favour and promotion¹⁴. It is probable that some of these officers (and others who were recipients of the legate's favour) came from Numidia (many on the military lists give their domicile as Lambaesis, Thamugadi, Cuicul and Cirta)¹⁵, and indeed, that Numidians normally formed a sizeable part of the pool of officers and those of officer potential. As the parents and relatives of these officers will have been in the majority, persons of some distinction in their patria (members of the local curia for example)¹⁶, there must at any one time have been several influential groups of families in Numidia's principal communities, whose collective prestige depended in no small way on the choice made by the incumbent legate in the matter of *provectus*. Inscriptions from various Numidian communities reveal that it was not just junior officers who formed ties of *amicitia* with the legate, but also local senators, flamines and advocates¹⁷. Some of these contacts will have been formed through kin serving with the forces, others as a result of the legate's close oversight of municipal affairs and his rôle as chief judiciary. In all, some 52 instances¹⁸ are recorded of citizens - mostly one suspects from Numidia's leading communities - who were personal clients of Numidian legates, and this situation was fostered by the general climate of continuous and pervasive dependence upon the legates, as evidenced at the municipal level by their regular co-optation as patrons of the community. Conversely, in *Africa Proconsularis*, where only one dedication from personal clients to a proconsul is known (IRT517), it would seem that the frequency of contact with, and dependence upon proconsuls, was appreciably less. It may be

¹⁴ 52 dedications to Numidian legates, or members of their family, by private clients are listed in the catalogue 'Personal Patrocinia' (n.4-56). Of these, 37 are by soldiers or junior officers, 5(n.4,25,49,52,53) by persons unknown, and 10(n.5,6,7,17,20,33,51,54,55,56) by local advocates, flamines or magistrates.

¹⁵ See n.13.

¹⁶ See M. Mahboubi, 'Les élites municipales de la Numidie: deux groupes: étrangers à la cité et vétérans', ANRW, 10, 2 (1982) pp.673-81, for a list of Numidian veterans attested as magistrates at Cuicul (BACTH (1913) p.130 and 165), Diana Veteranorum (C4594), Lamasba (C4436), civitas Nattabutum (C4827), Thamugadi (BACTH (1941-2)p.102) and Verecunda (C4196, 4197, 4243). In Lambaesis, a former *militiis* (C2757 = AE (1977) 863) and an *ex dec(urione) al(ae) Fl(aviae)* (AE(1914) 40) are attested as flamines, and a further four veterans as flamines of the curia *Hadriana felix veteranorum legionis tertiae Augustae* (C18214, 18234, AE (1916)22, (1968) 646 c.f. M. Leglay, 'La vie religieuse à Lambèse d'après les nouveaux documents', *Ant. Af.*, 5(1971) pp.133-5.

¹⁷ See n.14 for the 10 references to local bourgeoisie.

¹⁸ See catalogue 'Personal Patrocinia', n4-42, 44-52, 54-8.

significant that the text (possibly erected by the four acting local *magistri*)¹⁹ derives from Lepcis Magna, the only community in Proconsular Africa to record a sizeable sample of proconsuls as municipal patrons. The routine co-optation of governors in Numidia (and possibly in Lepcis Magna) inevitably tended to depersonalise the link between the officiating *magistri* and leading citizens and the governor concerned, and it was, perhaps, ^{an attempt} to offset this that partially explains the concurrent high incidence of personal patronage by governors in the same community.

More decisive in determining the different approach of Proconsular Africa to the co-optation of proconsuls as patrons, than either the antiquity of its urban institutions or the early loss of the proconsuls' military functions to the Numidian legate, was the sheer number of towns in the province. Salama, for example, lists over 250 sites in Tunisia alone, for which the Roman names are known or may be deduced and the list can be supplemented by those known only from literary sources and from texts whose provenance lies outside of Africa²⁰.

Urbanisation of this magnitude necessarily dictated some sort of rationalisation, and thus it is (as Warmington observes, p.50) that the more important communities are those which are normally attested as co-opting proconsular patrons, while smaller towns limited their attentions to minor officials or local persons of eminence²¹. As those towns which might consider themselves entitled by virtue of size, antiquity and/or Romanisation to apply for proconsular patronage still remained numerous, it inevitably followed that many also - perhaps only (as at Thugga) - conferred the honour on the most distinguished of their own citizens (or those from Carthage or nearby towns, who had connections with the community). In Numidia, outside of the Cirtan confederacy, this process is not attested until the Severans, but in Africa

¹⁹ For the view that the dedicands were II viri and aediles, see M. Torelli, 'Per una storia della classe dirigente di Leptis Magna', *Rendiconti Lincei* sér 8, 28, 1974, p.388.

²⁰ P. Salama, 'Les voies romaines de l'Afrique du Nord', Alger, 1951. Recent epigraphic finds have added the names and/or locations of several more communities. A useful list, with references to relevant publications, is provided by A. Mastino, 'La ricerca epigrafica in Tunisia (1973-85)', *L'Africa Romana Atti del I convegno di studio Sassari 16-17 dicembre 1983* (1984) pp.78-9. Note also J. Peyras, 'Deux études de toponymie et de topographie de l'Afrique antique', *Ant. Af.*, 22 (1986) pp.213-53. For African towns whose name, but not location is known, cf. C. Tissot, 'Géographie comparée de la province romaine d'Afrique', *II Paris* (1888), Appendix III pp.763-84.

²¹ For a list of the towns recording proconsuls as patrons, see list (A).

Proconsularis: the first equestrians co-opted are recorded as early as AD 42 and 54 (in Thugga, B17 and 22), and in about 140, the first attested senatorial patron of African origin, M. Cornelius Fronto (B47), makes his appearance²². After this date, the well documented ascent of Africans into the amplissimus ordo begins to make its mark on the African patronal lists, the next 50 years seeing another six local senators co-opted, with four times that total certainly attested for the next half century²³. Over this same century the rise of prominent local equestrians mirrored to a lesser extent the rise of senators, and nine (six holding imperial posts) are attested as patrons²⁴.

A straightforward connection between the wide diffusion of local senatorial and equestrian patrons for the period of the Severans (193-235) and the correspondingly low total of proconsular patrons (23-40 as against a mere 2) is hampered by the low volume of texts deriving from Africa in which proconsuls are actually mentioned. Only 20 African inscriptions refer to proconsuls for the entire third century (compared with 47 for the first century, 41 for the second, and a very high 121 for the fourth), and of these, only 15 are relevant to our period²⁵. Examination of all third century African texts (from 193 to 260) mentioning proconsuls will be deferred till later. If we now consider only those communities where proconsuls are attested as patrons in Africa (17 in all), it will be seen that 12 of these can be shown to have also co-opted local people as patrons, 12 of whom were of senatorial or equestrian distinction²⁶.

²² Fronto, a Cirtan, was patron not of his patria (cf. *Ad Amicos* II, 11), but of neighbouring Calama. The co-optation of local senators before this date is particularly likely for Cirta, where two members of the Pactumeii (including Africa's first consul, Q. Aurelius Pactumeius Fronto) were honoured with dedications in 73-4. Lacunae may have described either (or both) as patron (cf. IB132-134). Another potential local senatorial patron of early date (117-38) is [Ti. Iulius] Fronto, adlected by Trajan, likewise the recipient of a statue whose dedication is lacunary (cf. IB6). The text derives from Lepcis Magna.

²³ Six senators besides Fronto (AD138-93) - B51,55,64-5,76,77,C63(=B80-1).

²⁵ senators (AD193-238)-B83, 87, 88, 89, 90, 96, 97-8, 99, 103, 104, 105, 106A,107, 108, 110, 111, 113, C48, 78, 79, 82-82a, 84, 105A, 106-6a, 116. To the above may be added a further 12 senators of the C3 (B134, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 142, 146, C149, 150, 151, 152) and six senators of the C2 -C3 (B124, 125, 127, 130, 131, 132), most, if not all of whom, probably fell within the century 138-238.

²⁴ Nine equestrians (138-238) - B45,

56, 57, 85, 91, 95, C93, 94, 112, to which may probably be added B66,101, and 4 of uncertain dating in the C2 (B70) or C3 (B135,143,144-5). Those holding imperial posts are B56, 70, 85, 95, 135, 143, 144-5, C93, 94, 112.

²⁵ References to 12 appear in n.33 and 34. Three other texts concern two patrons (C84 = A89A, ined. (cf. *Tituli* V p.713) and AE (1971) 490 = C105A). Of unknown third century date is C1639 from Sicca Veneria.

²⁶ Senators - Bisica Lucana (C63,B125), Bulla Regia (B90,110, 146,C78,79,155),Gigthis (B103,104), Hippo Regius (B87,88), Karthago (B186), Lepcis Magna (B108, C157), Mactaris (B124), Madaurus (B202), Puppit (C123), Utika (B134,C149,150,151,152).

Equestrians - Lepcis Magna (B135,C174), Thubursicu Bure (B95).

Where these local patrons can be dated with some precision, it is apparent that their appearance did not automatically signal the end of proconsular co-optation in that particular town. This can be clearly established in three towns, Bulla Regia, Thubursicu Bure and Lepcis Magna, where locally nominated patrons (both senators and equestrians) antedate known proconsular patrons of the late third or fourth century²⁷.

Another two communities (Madauros and Theveste - C168a and A175,177) also show proconsular patrons at a late (fourth century) date, and in one of these (Madauros), we have specific evidence that a proconsul was patron contemporaneously with local men, in this case two flamines²⁸. Unfortunately, no other patrons are known for Theveste, but as a town of major strategic importance from the Flavian era, with local senators attested from the mid-second century, it too can be presumed to have co-opted its most eminent citizens well before the fourth century²⁹. Bisica Lucana may add a sixth name to the communities where local senators or equestrians are known to have been (or in the case of Theveste, can be assumed to have been) patrons, prior to, or in conjunction with, proconsuls. If so, it would be of considerable importance, as being the earliest example by some 70 years (with the exception of Bulla Regia, where the proconsul, as *patronus patriae*, may have been co-opted prior to this post). Only one other town, Turris Tamalleni, is recorded as producing a proconsular patron within

Others - Bisica Lucana (B33,125), Bulla Regia (B167), Madauros (B169,170,178), Thubursicu Numidarum (B199), Utika (B133). The only known local patron of Thubursicu Numidarum is a flamen (B199).

²⁷ Bulla Regia - (1) *procos.* (C105A, c217-8) and *uxor eius* (C106a, c217-8) - local senators (C78, 79, 193-211; B90, 196-7) - local equestrian (C93, 198-211) and also (2) *procos.* (C168, 326-33) and *parentes eius* (B167, 326-33) and (3) *procos.* (A163, 320-39) and (4) *procos.* (A201, post c324). - local senators (B110, c231; B146, early-mid C3; C155, mid-late C3. Thubursicu Bure - (1) *procos.* (A120, 260-7) and *fili* (*legati*)*eius* (A121, 122) - local equestrian (B95, 198-211). Lepcis Magna - (1) *procos.* (A156, late C3). - Iulia Avita Mamaea Augusta (niece of Lepcitane imp. L. Sept. Severus) (B108 - 222-35) and local equestrian (B135, C3) and also (2) *procos.* (A180, 377) - local equestrian (*v.p. praeses Trip.*) (C174, 340-50).

N.B. The first two proconsuls of Bulla Regia are themselves of local origin (i.e. of group (C)), whose co-optation may have preceded their proconsulship.

²⁸ The two flamines, whom one assumes were co-opted before the proconsul, actually pay for the cost of a statue erected to the proconsul by the *ordo* (B168a-70) cf. ILAlgI2162). The proconsul's patronage may, however, antedate his proconsulate. A native of Bulla Regia, where he was *patronus a parentibus* (cf. C168), he may well have had *praedia* and private interests in Madauros (c.100 km. south west by air).

²⁹ Major arterial roads led from Theveste north to Carthage and Hippo Regius, west to Lambaesis, east to Capsa and south to the limes at Ad Maiores. For the senators [-]linus under Pius, and the Annii from the beginning of the third century from Theveste, see M. Corbier, 'Les familles clarissimes d'Afrique Proconsularie (I^{er} - III^e siècle)', *Tituli V*, pp.731-2.

this span of 70 years, but no other patrons at all are known for the place. Although a municipium from the time of Hadrian, the epigraphic remains are scanty, and no local senators or equestrians are mentioned. It is therefore possible, as far as our evidence allows, that for some 70 years, the nomination of proconsuls as patrons fell into almost complete abeyance, and that this was somehow connected with the voluminous information we possess for the same period, that numerous communities were co-opting their own citizens of high birth. The period from Gallienus on, and more particularly the fourth century, may on this view be regarded as one which witnessed a resurgence of the co-optation of proconsuls. Against such a conclusion, however, it must be repeated that the epigraphy from this period which directly refers to proconsuls is slender, and the text from Bisica Lucana, if admitted as evidence, would prove that as late as the end of Commodus' reign (189-90), the co-optation of both proconsuls and local clarissimi was a normal procedure. One text (A67) discovered in Rome, indicates that M. Didius Severus Iulianus, proconsul of Africa (and future ill-fated emperor) was patron of Bisica Lucana in 189-90. An earlier text (by about a decade) from Bisica Lucana itself (C63), shows that the son of a proconsul, a certain Q. Servilius Pudens, was also co-opted as patron. It has been shown above (pp.52-3) that family members of patrons of group (A) were not normally themselves patrons in any real sense, despite the claimed extension of patronage to descendants on *tabulae patronatus*. It is, therefore, appropriate to seek some other reason for Servilius' elevation, and the answer most ready to hand lies in the family's African origo. Although their *patria* appears to have been Hippo Regius, a considerable distance (c160 km. by air) away, it was common for families of wealth and distinction to invest heavily in land and to have other estates and interests some distance from their normal residence³⁰. If this, or marriage connections with Bisica Lucana, led to the conferment of patronage on Servilius, and not his father's proconsulate, then his

³⁰ cf. the Pompeii Sosii for example, with property at Minturnae, Rome, Bologna, Volturnum, Tibur, Tusculum and probably also Apamea and Ciria (W.C. McDermott, 'Stemmata quid faciunt? The descendants of Frontinus', *Anc. Soc.*, 7, 1976, p.239).

patronage may be considered indistinguishable from that of a local senator³¹. As many other African communities important enough to possess their own senators and equestrians will also have been those with a tradition (or at least a precedent) of co-opting proconsuls, it is probable that the patronage of proconsuls and leading citizens coincided in several places at some early date in the second century, and the evidence from Bisica Lucana suggests that it continued to overlap at least up until almost the end of that century.

The inscription from Turris Tamalleni does at least show that the co-optation of non-local proconsuls was still possible under the early Severi, but can this simply be discarded as an isolated example? Other office holders from group (A) co-opted during the period 193-260 are also scarce in Africa Proconsularis. Only two are known, a curator rei publicae at Sabratha under Severus Alexander (A109), and a dux at Bisica Lucana (A119), who falls right at the end of the period, in 255-8. From the little evidence we have, two things can be said. Firstly, as the three office holders on whom the patronate was conferred are spread evenly across the chronological span of 193-260, and can be paralleled by other non-local administrators co-opted from elsewhere in Africa and the empire³², there was obviously no legal impediment preventing or limiting a community's choice in this matter. Secondly, not only is the number of African texts actually mentioning non-local administrators for the period 193 - 260 meagre for all types of postings, but few of those which fail to provide the detail of patronage (27 in all) may be said to give any inference that the individual concerned was not patron.

³¹ Servilius was also patron of Calama (c60 km. by air from his patria), where the family may also have had interests. Dedications to his mother and father (?) are also known from Tuccabor (C14852) and Althiburos (C27782). The former was erected by the ordo, the latter possibly so (there is a lacuna in the text after the name, which may be that of Servilius or his homonymous father). See IC 7-7d and 8-8b.

³²

Numidia	(1) leg. Aug. pr. pr. (A237) 197, (A238) 197-201, (A239) 198-211, (A242) 226, (A246) 247. (2) curator r.p. (A248) 251-2.
Mauretania	(1) proc. prov. Maur. (A288)c245, (A289) 247-9.
Lusitania	(1) leg. Aug. pr. pr. (AE (1952) 116) 213-4.
Tarraconensis	(1) leg. Aug. pr. pr. (C2.3741) 198-206, (C6.1454) 222.
Tres Galliae	(1) curator r.p. (C13.1806) 222-35.
Dacia	(1) proc. prov. Dac. Apul. (AE (1972) 466) c235, (C3.1456) 238.
(?) Alpes	(1) praeses prov. Alp. Marit. (C5.7880) C3.

The 27 texts are distributed between four classes of administrator - **proconsuls** (12), legates of the proconsul (3 - but two appear on the same text as **two** proconsuls), procurators (8) and *curatores rei publicae* (6). Five of the 12 inscriptions relating to proconsuls do not constitute any of the known types for which patronage of proconsuls (or for that matter of any African administrator) is recorded, and may be dismissed³³. The remaining seven inscriptions are all erected by the *ordo*, the proconsul appearing either eponymously (three cases) or as overseer³⁴, and in one of the former group, a lacuna after the proconsul's office may have described his patronate (AE(1958) 142). Unlike Numidia, very few texts in *Africa Proconsularis* where an administrator's *patrocinium* is not mentioned, can be cross-referenced with others from the same town which do. Only four examples³⁵ are known for proconsuls, compared with 44 for Numidia's *legati* (see above list D(b)). Three are first century dedications from Lepcis Magna and refer to two proconsular patrons (A11 and 21). The other, a third century statue base from Bulla Regia (C105A) can be disregarded, as mention of the proconsul's *patrocinium* may have appeared in a lacuna at the bottom of the text. The inclusion or omission of *patrocinium* on texts where the proconsul dedicates a building work or statue, was, to judge from numerous verifiable Numidian examples, entirely arbitrary. The four third century official dedications by proconsuls, which fail to mention *patrocinium*, are, therefore, unsatisfactory as evidence that the proconsuls concerned were not co-opted, and the same may probably be said for the three texts where the proconsul appears eponymously, this being an uncommon form for mention of patronage to occur in Africa³⁶.

From the inscriptions so far cited, we are in no position to comment upon patterns of proconsular co-optation for the period 193-260. Only one text, possibly from the

³³ IRT517, C15876, C11999, ILAlg1467 and ined. (cf. *Tituli V*, p.713) from Lepcis Magna, Sicca Veneria, Vazi Sarra, near Calama and Thibica.

³⁴ eponymous - AE(1958)142, (*Hippo Regius*), ILT1047 (*Karthago*), C1170 (*Ucres*).
overseer - C10026 (*Hadrumetum*), IRT461 (*Lepcis Magna*), ILT614 (*[Na]ragsara*, C14395 (*Vaga*).

³⁵ Lepcis Magna - IRT269 and 540 (cf.n.11) and AE (1968) 549 (cf. n.21) Bulla Regia - AE (1971) 490 (cf. n 105A).

³⁶ Only two examples are known for *Africa Proconsularis* (A5 = IRT319 and A14a = AE(1935)32) - both proconsuls - and none at all for Numidia and Mauretania.

same period, provides any firm proof that at least one African community elected not to co-opt a particular proconsul, but this, as we shall see, does not indicate a new trend either for proconsuls or for other administrators of Africa Proconsularis. The inscription is a dedication by the *ordo* from the base of a statue erected to the proconsul M. Flavius Sabarrus Vet[tius] Severus³⁷. It has already been observed (p.53) that inscriptions of this type, which omit reference to the recipient's *patrocinium*, are the clearest evidence our sources permit for establishing cases where *patrocinium* was never conferred. We may add that the town involved in this instance, Sicca Veneria, was an important community, and as prestigious (or more so) than known client-communities of proconsuls of Africa, although no patrons of any sort are known for it before the fourth century³⁸. The text from Sicca Veneria can be closely paralleled with another statue base erected by the *ordo* to a proconsul, this time from Thysdrus, a town rivalling Sicca Veneria in importance, but for which no patrons are to date attested³⁹. The dedication to L. Catilius Severus Iulianus Claudius Reginus is approximately a century earlier (AD124-5) and like that to Flavius Sabarrus, advances no motive for its erection. Two other statue bases erected by the *ordines* of Karthago and nearby Maxula in the fourth century, attest the continuance of the practice of selective co-optation of proconsuls, both dedications in this instance, characteristically of the period, providing fulsome accounts of their recipient's *merita*⁴⁰. The services of one of these proconsuls, Iulius Festus Hymetius, appear to have been quite exceptional. The *concilium provinciae Africae* which erected the dedication, states that he staved off a famine ('*depulsam ab eadem provincia famis et inopiae vastitatem*')⁴¹, and revitalised the provincial priesthood ('*studium sacerdotii provinciae restituerit ut nunc a competitoribus adpetatur quod antea formidini fuerit*'), and that for these actions

³⁷ C1639 = NA9.

³⁸ Sicca stood at the junction of principal routes leading to Carthage, Thabraca, Cirta and Theveste. The 3 patrons of Sicca are all *curatores rei publicae* (C160, 161 and A173). One (C160), may only have been patron of the *Venerii* (a religious college) and not of Sicca itself (cf. CIL VIII supp. pars V fasc. III p.286 and C. Lepelley, '*Les cités*', II p.157).

³⁹ ILA 43 = NA5. For Thysdrus' expansion under the Flavians and its rise to '*capitale de l'huile*' in the second century, see M. Leglay, '*Les Flaviens et l'Afrique*', MEFR, 80, 1968, p.229.

⁴⁰ Maxula (AD301) - C12459 = NA11; Karthago (AD375-8) - C6.1736 = NA15.

⁴¹ The incident is also recorded in Ammianus, XXVIII, I, 17-23.

became the first proconsul to be honoured with gilt statues in both Carthage and Rome. It is, therefore, all the more surprising that in these circumstances he was not proffered the patronate. Although the text is erected by the provincial council, rather than the Carthaginian *ordo*, Hymetius' *cursus* is treated in some detail, and patronage of the capital of the province, where the council had their seat, would surely be pertinent in the context of the inscription, if he had in fact been co-opted.

If Hymetius, despite the considerable boons brought by his administration, was not elected patron by Carthage, it may be that the co-optation of proconsuls had at this date (AD375-8) been abandoned in the capital, which now sought to reward benevolent administrators by other means. However, as the only proconsul of Africa known as patron of Carthage is much earlier (c155-6 - see A50), there is no way of being able to pinpoint when the practice fell into desuetude over this span of 220 years. If indeed, the practice was abandoned, it may just as well have happened in the fourth century, as in the period under discussion (193-260). However, whatever the situation may have been in the capital, elsewhere in the province, proconsular patrons are relatively well documented for the fourth century, the last-attested being, in fact, Hymetius' successor, a patron of Lepcis Magna (A180).

Thus far, it has been seen that four large African communities could, if they chose, render gratitude to a proconsul by erecting in his honour a statue, rather than through co-optation, and that one of these, Thysdrus, took this option as early as Hadrian's reign. If Romanelli is correct about the sense of the expression '*pro [ami]citia quae eis [cum] patre est*' on a text from Thugga dating to AD3-6,⁴² a far earlier precedent for not electing to co-opt proconsular patrons is established. The expression appears on a statue base erected by the Thuggenses to the son of the proconsul L. Passienus Rufus, who was serving under his father as military tribune (C26580). Although Passienus' patronage has been accepted by both B. Warmington and C. Poinssot, the view is rejected by P. Romanelli, for whom the text is '*Non un vero rapporto di patronato*

⁴²A date as early as 1BC or AD1 has, however, been posited as plausible by R. Syme, '*Roman Papers*', Oxford, 1979, pp.223 and 1091.

infine, ma una relazione di amicizia con un proconsole e la sua famiglia', and the same point is taken up by F. Engesser⁴³. While the terms *amicitia* and *patrocinium* need not be mutually exclusive, the fact that none of Thugga's 27 recorded patrons include any African administrators makes it improbable that the community co-opted Passienus. The attestation of *amicitia* between administrator and community, unique in African epigraphy, probably arose from circumstances peculiar to the war being conducted against the Gaetuli in this region⁴⁴. These special circumstances, combined with the fact that Thugga, by virtue of its small size and dependence on Carthage, was not a town prominent enough to compete with others seeking proconsular patronage, unfortunately diminishes the value of the evidence of the Thuggan text as a precedent for the selective co-optation of proconsuls. If the origins of this process cannot be pushed back to a pre-Hadrianic date, it would be injudicious, on the basis of just four texts, to find a causal link between the dating of the earliest known example and the approximately contemporaneous appearance of the first attested co-optation of a local African senator. On the other hand, as the texts cover a broad span both chronologically and geographically, they do suggest that the element of selectivity in the co-optation of proconsuls was a common, perhaps even a regular feature, from (at least) the early second century on.

It has been mentioned that this process of selectivity applied not only to proconsuls of Africa, but also to other imperial administrators of the province. In all, some 15 honorific statues, relating to 14 other functionaries in proconsular Africa, fail to refer to their patronage⁴⁵. The texts were set up by the ordines of 8 different towns, and 8 different African postings are involved, including proconsular legate, procurator and *curator reipublicae*. With the possible exception of Lepcis Magna, where all complete

⁴³ B. Warmington, p.40 n.2; C. Poinssot, 'M. Licinius Rufus, patronus pagi et civitatis', *BACTH* n.s.V, 1969, pp.230-1 n.1; P. Romanelli, 'Storia delle province romane dell'Africa', Roma, 1959, p.224, F. Engesser, pp.61-2. L. Harmand omits all mention of the text.

⁴⁴ For this conflict, see R. Syme, loc. cit., P. Romanelli, loc. cit., M. Benabou, 'La résistance africaine à la romanisation', Paris, 1976, pp.61-3 and T. R. S. Broughton, 'The romanization of Africa Proconsularis', New York 1968, pp.81 and 89. Note an ex-voto erected by a husband and wife, who describe themselves as 'conservati' during Passienus' governorship. (El Lehs near Assuras, C16456, and compare T.R.S. Broughton, op. cit., p.81 n.203).

⁴⁵ *NAI*, 2, 3, 6-6a, 12, 13, 14, 18, *NC* 4, 7, 8, 10, 16, 17.

honorific statues to proconsuls mention their patronage, and where (for the first century at least) numerous proconsular patrons are known, it seems probable that no Africa Proconsularis posting entitled its bearer to assume that he had entitlement to automatic patronal rights over any town under his purview. Indeed, in six instances, not even the advantages of local birth sufficed to ensure co-optation. Interestingly, three of the six concerned (two *curatores rei publicae* and an *a(d)vocatus f(isci)* at *patrimonium Karthag(inis)*, NC7,8 and 10) fall in the third century (193-260)⁴⁶, and illustrate that to whatever extent curators and lesser officials supplanted proconsuls as municipal patrons in this period, their co-optation could be subject to rigorous scrutiny. Two of the three, for example, notwithstanding specific benefactions, were still apparently passed over as patrons. More will be said on this matter in chapter XII. For the present, we may add that not all communities in Africa Proconsularis were as chary in their conferment of the patronate on local curators. In fact, only one of the six recorded third-century curators co-opted as municipal patron in the province, was not of local origin. The advent of the office of curator in Africa under the Severans inevitably led to some erosion of influence of the proconsul⁴⁷, and, consequently, it is possible that some towns elected to co-opt curators in their stead. Unfortunately, the impact is impossible to quantify, since almost all of the curators known to have been co-opted, were, apart from the office, indistinguishable from other local seigneurs also enrolled as patrons.

After the Diocletianic provincial and administrative reforms, the *auctoritas* of the African proconsul suffered a considerable and permanent diminution. Although proconsuls appear to have regained the control over municipal building policy usurped

⁴⁶ Besides these three examples, only two other honorific statues erected by the *ordo* to an imperial functionary, which make no reference to the recipient's patronage, are attested for the period 193-260. Both were erected at Theveste, in 211-2 to a certain M. Aemilius Clodianus, *proc. Augg. nn. patrimonii reg. Leptiminensis item privatae reg. Tripolitanae* by Tripolitanan communities (Oea and Sabratha) which evidently profited from his administration (NA6-6a). Although an African, Clodianus' patria Theveste was too far from his client communities (c300 and 350 miles by air) for Clodianus to be considered a local.

⁴⁷ Cf. C. Lucas, 'Notes on the *curatores rei publicae* of Roman Africa', JRS, XXX (1940) p.56, 'The first known curator in Africa belongs to AD196 - nearly a century after the office was initiated'. For their oversight of municipal finances and building projects, cf. *ib.* pp.65-6 and F. Jacques, 'Les curateurs des cités africaines au III^e siècle', ANRW, 10,2 pp.1122-5, comparing their rôle as building supervisor to that of a 'véritable curator operum' (p.123).

by the *curatores rei publicae*⁴⁸, they now governed a greatly reduced territory, two new provinces Byzacena and Tripolitana having been carved from Africa Proconsularis, and placed under the authority of *praesides* or *consulares*. Moreover, some of their previous functions, were now taken over by new officials, most noticeably by the vicar, who, for instance, now organised the collection of Rome's food supplies⁴⁹. Notwithstanding this loss of authority, proconsuls continue to be found as patrons within their province, and even, in one exceptional instance, beyond it⁵⁰. The newly created *praesides* and *consulares* of Tripolitana and Byzacena are also found as municipal patrons (the former in some number), as are two vicars⁵¹. Now, as before, African communities continued to exercise discretion in the co-optation of officials. Honorific statues by the *ordo* to two *praesides* of Tripolitana, a *comes et dux* of Tripolitana and a *consularis* of Byzacena, make no mention of patronage, thereby indicating that they were passed over for co-optation⁵². Three of these statues come from Lepcis Magna, a place which has not so far produced any parallels for its earlier proconsular governors (although one peremptory dedication is known for a proconsular legate which fails to record his patronage)⁵³. Possibly, Lepcis Magna only opted to be selective in the choice of its governors as patrons, when it acquired its new status as provincial capital of Tripolitana, but as honorific statues not mentioning patronage are nowhere numerous, the absence of the same for the first three centuries at Lepcis need not carry much weight.

In Numidia, where the legate was superseded by a *consularis* of the province, two individuals are recorded as patrons (one of them being patron of two communities)⁵⁴.

⁴⁸ Cf. C. Lucas, *op. cit.*, pp.71-2, 73-4.

⁴⁹ Cf. B. H. Warmington, 'The North African provinces from Diocletian to the Vandal conquest', Cambridge, 1954, p.3.

⁵⁰ A180. The patronate of Decimius Hesperius was accorded in singular circumstances. The proconsul was associated with the vicar Nicomachus Flavianus in pronouncing against the injustices inflicted by a previous official (Count Romanus) upon the Lepcitanes (cf. Ammianus XXVIII 6.1-30 and C. Lepelley, 'Les cités', II, pp.354-62).

⁵¹ 10 *praesides* of Tripolitana (A158, 159, 165, 176, 182, 193, 194, 195, 198, 204), one *consularis* of Byzacena (A164), 2 vicars (A181, 183).

⁵² NA12, 13, 14 and 18.

⁵³ IRT531(=NA3).

⁵⁴ A259 and 265. (The clients are Constantina (=Cirta), Milev and Thamugadi).

As before, patronage does not appear to have been exercised outside of the six largest communities (and their satellites in the case of Cirta), and to judge from the continuing absence of honorific statues to officials, who are not stated to be patrons, co-optation remained the same automatic formality it had been for two centuries.



Thugga - statue base in the theatre to Thugga's only known senatorial patron, M. Paccius Silvanus Coredius Gallus L. Pullaienus Gargilius Antiquus, cos. (B55).

Chapter VI The Distribution and Status of Group (B) Patrons

Group (B) patrons, that is persons of local (or neighbouring) origo who held no imperial administrative or military posts in the province of their patria, form the largest of the four groups of African patrons known to us. In all, 138 patrons are recorded, and 141 instances of patrocinia. As with patrons of group (A), they are most numerous in Africa Proconsularis (109 patrons, and 110 instances of patrocinia), and less so in Numidia (17 patrons and 18 instances of patrocinia) and Mauretania (13 patrons and 13 instances of patrocinia). Chart (A) below, places group (B) patrons in perspective with those from group (A), and (for the sake of completeness) those of groups (C) and (D)

Chart (A) Distribution of Patrons by Group and Province

Group	Africa Procos.	Numidia	Mauretania	Total
Group (A)	62 (74)	36 (48)	10 (11)	108 (132)
Group (B)	109 (110)	17 (18)	13 (13)	138 (141)
Group (C)	27 (30)	4 (6)	3 (3)	34 (39)
Group (D)	6 (6)	2 (2)	8 (8)	16 (16)
Total	202 (219)	59 (74)	34 (35)	294 (329)

N.B. Unbracketed figures refer to patrons, bracketed to patrocinia. The total of group (B) patrons is one less than the sum of the totals of each province, one patron (B102=240) having clients in both Africa Proconsularis (Calama) and Numidia (Thibilis). Again, the total of all patrons is two less than that for the sum of the totals of all groups, as one patron of group (B) (B96=A238) at Uzappa in Africa Proconsularis also had several clients in Numidia during his command of the third legion, and Q. Servilius Pudens, C63, probably equals the homonym B80-1. Besides Servilius, the persons concerned are well-known figures, Vibia Aurelia

Sabina daughter of Marcus Aurelius and Q. Anicius Faustus leg. Aug. pr. pr. in Numidia.

It will be noticed from these figures, that multiple patrocina, whilst a common enough feature of group (A) patrons - for those of Numidia, it indeed appears to be the norm - is a virtually negligible factor for patrons of group (B). 16 of group (A)'s patrons had more than one client, compared with only three for group (B), and the discrepancy between patrons and patrocina, 26 in the case of group (A), but only three for group (B), presents an even wider divergence between the two groups. The low yield of instances of multiple patrocina amongst group (B) patrons is somewhat surprising, given that it was not unusual for local nobility to have property and interests elsewhere in Africa than in their own patria. The low figure is however, mitigated by five cases attested for group (C) patrons, for whom co-optation in most (or all ?) cases (see p.160-2) was probably antecedent to the acquisition of an African posting, and another 15 and five cases for group (B) and (C) patrons respectively, where patronage can reasonably be surmised amongst the *incerti*¹. The high incidence of multiple patrocina amongst patrons of group (A) is readily explicable by the nature of the offices which the patrons occupied. In all but one instance, the patrons concerned were proconsules, praesides or Numidian legati, whose functions required them to regularly tour their provinces, visiting set towns (in particular those marked out as *assize* centres), where co-optation of the governor came to be a regular or at least a relatively frequent event. The exception is early (AD27-8), and concerns a military tribune, to whom four clients erected *tabulae patronatus* (A9-9c). His patronage of these towns (all insignificant) may relate to military campaigns in their vicinity - mopping up operations and the re-establishment of authority after Tacfarinas' revolt (17-24) - or to land acquired there by the tribune during his term of office, and which in the aftermath of war was no doubt available at a knock-down price.

¹ For the 15 group (B) *incerti* see IB7,15,27,56,65,69,76,81,101,139,140,141,146,150,154. The five group (C) *incerti* are, IC3,8,11,20, and 32. Note also, that IB66 = C94.

The three documented group (B) patrons (B.102 = 240, 179-179a, 213-213a) with two or more clients were, significantly, all persons of great wealth and influence. Addressing one of the patrons, a certain Romanianus, patron of Thagaste and of an unspecified number of neighbouring communities, Augustine declares, 'tu interea viveres in aedificiorum exquisitissimus molibus in nitore balnearum, in tesseris quas honestas non respuit'², and architectural remains survive, indicating a lifestyle on the same grand scale for the other two patrons. These are the imposing circular mausoleum erected four kilometres from his patria by Q. Lollius Urbicus, Hadrian's redoubtable military commander, 'le plus glorieux des enfants de Tiddis'³, and patron both at Tiddis itself and at the neighbouring castellum of Caldis; and 'the elegant marble-paved house' with traces of its formal garden (including the statue of a small boy fishing) from Thibilis⁴, where lived Q. Antistius Burrus, consul of 181, and husband of Vibia Aurelia Sabina, Marcus Aurelius' daughter. His wife was patron both here, and at Calama, where the family no doubt also owned estates. We must imagine that numerous other great seigneurs also enjoyed multiple patrocina, nor will these necessarily all have been senators and equestrians. A strong candidate, for example, is P. Iulius Liberalis, patron of Verecunda in Numidia (B245). A municipal magistrate in Thamugadi, he was also flamen at Thysdrus, several hundred kilometres to the east, and held the prestigious post of sacerdos provinciae Africae. One inscription (AE(1980)955), describes him as 'pater senator[um, avus cla]rissimor. puerorum', and the ordo at Cuicul, in another inscription (C4252, in which a lacuna may well have described him as patron), states that statues were erected to him both at Cuicul and at Thamugadi, his patria. Liberalis, aptly named, may also have been patronus patriae - a fountain erected by him at Thamugadi survives, its cost detailed to the last sesterce (AE (1979) 670).

Examination of chart (A) above, reveals that the numerical superiority of group (B) patrons over those in group (A) is almost entirely due to the large contingent of patrons

² Augustine, *Contra Academicos*, I.2.

³ A. Berthier, 'Tiddis, antique castellum Tidditanorum', *Alger* (1951) 37.

⁴ P. MacKendrick, 'The North African Stones Speak', *London* (1980) pp.204-5.

known from group (B) in Africa Proconsularis. Group (A) patrons barely number more than half those of group (B) - 62 cf. 109 - although the totals of patrocina raise the percentage to two thirds - 74 cf. 110. In Numidia, the situation is reversed, with group (A) patrons being more than double the number of their counterparts from group (B) - 36 cf. 17 - and this imbalance rises to five eighths when the totals of patrocina are considered - 48 cf. 18. In Mauretania, where figures are admittedly low, the situation changes again to one of approximate parity, with 10 and 13 patrons known from groups (A) and (B) respectively. (The totals of patrocina are virtually the same - 11 and 13). Interpretation of the Mauretanian evidence is best left open, owing to the poor output of Mauretanian epigraphy, but solutions can be proposed for the very different situations in Africa Proconsularis, where group (B) patrons dominate, and Numidia, where the dominance falls to patrons of group (A).

Africa Proconsularis

As regards Africa Proconsularis, it has already been noted (p.95) that at the very time when the epigraphic evidence for proconsuls is at its lowest - viz. the period from Severus to Gallienus - local senators and equestrians appear as patrons in prodigious quantities. In fact, for the third century as a whole, only seven group (A) patrons are known, as against 45 from group (B), the overwhelming majority of whom are senators (27) and equestrians (9). Three of the nine who remain, comprise an h(onestae) m(emoriae) v(ir) - probably equestrian - (B101), a Carthaginian magistrate (B86) and a duoviralic(i) filius (B141), the father (?) of a clarissimus vir (see p.122). The other six are persons of unknown status, 3 of whom were possibly senators⁵. In the second century too, group (B) patrons are in the ascendant (24 examples compared to 10 for group (A))⁶, although the margin is far narrower. (The total of group (A)

⁵ Group (A) - A89A,109,119,120,121,122,156

Group (B) - (1) senators - B80-81,83,87,88,89,90,96(=238),97-98,99,102(=240)
103,104,105,106A,107,108,110,111,113,134,136,137,138,139,140,142,146.
(2) equestrians - B85,91,95,115,117,135,143,144-5,153
(3) status unknown - B100,148,154
(4) possible senators - ?B92,118,133 (clarissimus puer ?, pater clarissimi iuvenis and pater clarissimi viri respectively).

⁶ Group (B)-B38,39,40,41,42,45,46,47,51,55,56,57,58,59,62,64-5,66,70,72,73,74,75,76,77
Group (A) - A43,44,49,50,52,53,54,60,61,67.

patrons is 41.67% that for group (B) in the second century, and plummets to a mere 15.55% in the third century). This is partly due to the particularly rich testimony from Thugga, all of whose 27 patrons belong to group (B), with the majority (15-16) being datable to the second century (see list E1)⁷. It is also, however, explained by the steady conferment of the patronate on local senators (first attested in the reign of Pius) and equestrians (only three of whom - all Thuggan - antedate Pius)⁸. Of the 24 recorded group (B) patrons of the second century, 14 are datable to the period between the reigns of Pius and Severus (five of the remaining ten are Trajanic or Hadrianic, and the other five are of an uncertain date in the second century)⁹, and, as in the third century, the majority are once more senators (6) and equestrians (3). The well documented rise of Africans into the equestrian, and above all into the senatorial ordo, obviously had enormous ramifications in the pattern of co-optation among African communities. From the surviving epigraphic evidence, some measure of the quantity of local eminentissimi being co-opted can be gathered, and the figures are impressive. We have already seen the totals of group (B) senators and equestrians for the second century (post Pius) and the third century. When to these, are added those of an indeterminate date between 138 and 283, and the senatorial and equestrian patrons of group (C) who also fall within this period¹⁰, we arrive at a grand total of 58 senators and 15 equestrians of local or neighbouring origo, whose co-optation can be assigned to the period 138-283.

Detail is provided in chart (B) below.

⁷ C2 Thuggan patrons - B38,39,40,41,42,45,46,55,57,58,59,66,69,74,75 (and 68?).

⁸ C2 senators (138-93) - B47,51,55,64-5,76,77

C2 equestrians (138-93) - B46,56,57, (and cf.70 - date in C2 uncertain)
equestrians (ante 138) - B17 (AD42), 22 (AD54), 39 (128-38)

⁹ Group (B) (96-138) - B38,39,40,41,42,45

Group (B) (imprecise C2 dating) - B70,72,73,74,75

Group (B) (138-93) - senators and equestrians (see above), others (see below).

¹⁰ Group (B) senators, (AD138-283)-B124,125,127,130,131,132

Group (C) senators C2 - C48,63

Group (C) senators C3 - C78,79,82-82a,84,105A,106-106a,112,116,123,147,149,150,151,152,
155,157

Group (C) equestrians, C3-C93,94,112

**CHART (B) Chronological Distribution of Local Senatorial and
Equestrian Patrons for the Second/Third Centuries A.D.**

(Groups (B) and (C)).

Group and Status	C2 (138-93)	C3 (193-283)	C2 - C3	Total
Group (B) - senators	6	27	6	39
Group (C) - senators	2	17 (19)		19 (21)
Group (B) - equestrians	3	9		12
Group (C) - equestrians		3		3
TOTAL	11	56 (58)	6	73 (75)

N.B. (1) Bracketed figures refer to patrocina (given only where different from the total of patrons).

(2) Excluding two senatorial patrons from group (C) (C123 and 157), none of the patrons totalled here can definitely be assigned a date between Gallienus and Diocletian. Most - probably all - of the seven group (B) patrons (B130,135,136,137,138,139,140 and 153) and one group (C) patron (C155), for whom a secure terminus ante quem dating cannot be provided, predate Gallienus.

If it is remembered, that the total of group (A) patrons known to us from Africa Proconsularis for the same period is only 15 (8 for the second century (post Pius) and seven for the third century), it will be seen that this is far smaller than the total of just senatorial patrons from group (B) (39), and appreciably smaller than their peers from group (C) (19). Equestrians, whether from groups (B) or (C), although indubitably more numerous than senators in proconsular Africa, never attain more than 50% of the senatorial total, even though their numbers too, increase from the second to the third century.

Confirmation of the far greater importance which African communities placed on the possession of senatorial - as opposed to equestrian - status, in consideration of co-

optation, can be found by comparing the statue bases erected by ordines in Africa Proconsularis to local senators on the one hand, and to local equestrians on the other. In the case of senators, a total of 53 statue bases put up by ordines in Africa Proconsularis, specifically mention that the recipient of the statue was patron (36 are from group (B), another 17 from group (C))¹¹. Only 12 statue bases erected by ordines to local senators, however, can be said to unequivocally omit mention of patronage, and in seven of these instances the recipient was female¹². The situation is quite different for equestrians. Not only is the number of statue bases erected to patrons smaller - 19 (15 from group (B) and 4 from group (C)) - but this total is actually appreciably less than the total of statues erected by ordines to local equestrians who are clearly not described as patrons (34))¹³. If we follow R. Duthoy and subdivide equestrians under two major headings, 'equites fonctionnels' and 'equites honorifiques', group (B) patrons are split almost evenly, with 10 and 9 patrons in each

11	(1)	Senatorial patrons conferred statues by the ordo - group (B)	Total
	C2	B47,55,64-5,76,77, (cf. B51 - statue to family member)	- 5
	C3	B80-1,83,87,88,89,97-8,102,103,104,105,106A,107,108,111 113,132,134,137,138,139,140,142,146 (cf. B96 - statue to family member)	- 23
	C4	B192,202,20	- 3
	C2-C3-	B124,125,127,130,131	- 5
	TOTAL	36	
	(2)	Senatorial patrons conferred statues by the ordo group (C)	
	C2	C48,63	- 2
	C3	C79,84,114,123,147,149,150,151,152,155 (cf. C78 statue to family member)	-10
	C4	157,160,161,168,168a	-5
	TOTAL		- 17
	(3)	Equestrian patrons conferred statues by the ordo - group (B)	
	C1	B22(ii)	-1
	C2	B39 (i-ii), 56,57,70	-5
	C3	B91 (i-ii), 95,115,117,135,143,153	- 8
	C4	B200 (cf. B188 - statue to family member)	- 1
	TOTAL		- 15
	(4)	Equestrian patrons conferred statues by the ordo-group (C)	
	C3	C93,94,112	- 3
	C4	C174	- 1
	Total		- 4

¹² See NB 26, 27, 29, 34, 37 and NC6, 25. The 5 male senators are NB31, 32, 34, 37 and NC7. There is only one example of a male senator outside of Africa Proconsularis (NB37 - Numidia).

¹³ See the same list. All but five of the 34 are group (B). Group (B) NB 41-68: group (C) NC4, 8, 10, 16, 17.

subdivision respectively¹⁴. In fact, despite the apparent equality of potential for co-optation, it is apparent that 'equites fonctionnels' were by far the most sought after of the two, since numerically they were greatly inferior to 'equites honorifiques'. This bias is again borne out by contrasting the number of statue bases erected by the ordo to patrons with those erected to 'non-patrons' for each equestrian type. The figures are 11 bases to patrons, compared with 8 to 'non-patrons' for 'equites fonctionnels', but 7 bases to patrons compared with 26 to 'non-patrons' for 'equites honorifiques'¹⁵. Although the likelihood of co-optation for local equestrians defined as 'fonctionnels' was by these figures not to be compared with the high success rate for senators (53 patrons cf. to 5 (male) 'non-patrons' - see above) it was nevertheless a substantial improvement on the prospects of 'equites honorifiques'. The greater popularity of senators over equestrians, and, amongst the latter, of 'equites fonctionnels' over 'equites honorifiques', in the selection of patrons from group (B) in Africa Proconsularis for the period 138-283, was inevitable in a society as hierarchical as the Roman model, and eminently pragmatic, given the wider circle of high level contacts enjoyed by senators and career equestrians. Local eminentissimi opened up new avenues of mediation with the central authority both in Rome and Africa, and unlike administrators in the province of external origin, could, by virtue of their local attachments and obligations, be generally relied upon to serve their community continuously, whether at home or abroad. Moreover, the self-perpetuation of their

¹⁴ R. Duthoy's arguments for the importance of this dichotomy in the equestrian ordo in relation to municipal patronage, are sound ('Le profil social des patrons municipaux en Italie sous le Haut-Empire', *Ancient Society*, 15-17, (1984-6), p.123 ff.). Under 'equites fonctionnels', are ranked praesides, procuratores, praefecti, advocati fisci, and other high ranking imperial officials, as well as holders of the *tres militiae* and certain *primipilares* (not recorded among patrons in Africa). Under 'equites honorifiques', fall those officers not attested as having attained the last of the *tres militiae*, *curatores rei publicae*, *iudices ex quinque decuriis*, *praefecti fabrum*, the remaining *primipilares*, and the very large number of persons described simply, as *eques Romanus*, *equo publico*, or v.e.. 'Equites fonctionnels' are asterisked in the distribution list of group (B) patrons, list (A).

¹⁵ 'Equites fonctionnels' - patrons conferred statues by the ordo.

- group (B): C1-B22(2); C2-B56; C3-B95,115,117,135,143; C4-B200

- group (C): C3-C93,94; C4-C174

'Equites honorifiques' - patrons conferred statues by the ordo.

- group (B): C2 - B39,57,70; C3 - B91(i), 91(ii), 153

- group (C): C2-C112

'Equites fonctionnels' - 'non-patrons' conferred statues by the ordo.

NB 46,47,53,54,56,65 (group (B)) and NC4 and 8 (group (C)).

'Equites honorifiques' - 'non-patrons' conferred statues by the ordo.

NB 40-45, 48-52, 55, 57-64, 66-8 (group (B)) and N C10,16,17 (group (C)).

numbers was generally ensured by putting into frequent practice, the provisions in the *tabulae patronatus* whereby a patron's descendants inherited the honour¹⁶. This, as has been seen (pp.52-3) was in contradistinction to patrons of group (A), whose descendants, while patrons *de iure*, appear never to have been so in practice. The large numbers of local senators and equestrians known to have been conferred the patronate between Pius and Diocletian do not, therefore, in themselves require any laboured explanation. Basically, they are no more than a reflection of the social forces which produced the turgid stream of Africans adlected into the senatorial and equestrian ordines during this period. The advantages to be accrued from the co-optation of these *novi homines* were self-evident. The pattern of such co-optation manifested itself early, and was both a symptom and a cause of the expanding prosperity and civic status of African communities.

AD138-283. The Dominance of Local Senatorial and Equestrian Patroni over (a) Group (A) Patrons and (b) Local Patrons of Lesser Status

The interpretation of two factors associated with the rise of local senatorial and equestrian patrons is, however, far more difficult to assess than the rise itself. The first of these concerns the low total of group (A) patrons over the same period (15 - cf. 39 group (B) senators and 12 group (B) equestrians)¹⁷ and the second, the almost equally low number of remaining group (B) patrons (16-21)¹⁸ - i.e. those not

¹⁶ The extension of patronage to a patron's descendants, well attested for senatorial families of group (B), is also, to a lesser extent, documented for the families of local equestrians and Carthaginian *magistri* (see list (B)). An inscription from Uzappa (C11935), however, which refers to a '[i(u)enis] c(larissimus), patroni f[il(ius)]' (son of B118) appears to indicate that the conferment of patronage, even on a senator's son, was not mandatory. The only other text referring to Uzappa's patrons (C11933), in fact, concerns another c(larissimus) i(u)enis who is this time specified as 'patronus, patroni filius' (see B96). The latter text is the earlier by some 50-70 years. A text from Thugga also indicates that the co-optation of a patron's son was not automatic (C1548=15550). The co-optation of the son of a certain Cincius Victor appears to have taken place after his own, rather than simultaneously. How long the interval was cannot be determined, but it clearly followed a number of benefactions given by Victor on the occasion of his own co-optation (B45,46). See further p.311.

¹⁷ Group A:	A49,50,52,53,54,60,61,67 (AD138-193)	Total : 8
"	A89A, 109,119,120,121,122,156 (AD193-283)	Total : 7
¹⁸ Group (B):	B45,58,59,62,66 (AD138-193)	Total : 5
	B86,92,100,101,118,133,141,148,154 (AD93-283)	Total : 9
	B128,129 (161-324, probably ante 283)	Total : 2

The 16 examples above dating between 138 and 283 may be augmented by 5 of uncertain dating in the C2, or between the C2 and C3-B69, 72,73, 74, and 75. Note the undated patron also at B206.

described as being senators or equestrians, and those of unknown rank - again for the same period. It has already been seen (p.95) that owing to the paucity of epigraphic evidence for group (A) administrators (particularly proconsuls) in Africa Proconsularis during the third century, no direct correlation between the low total of those co-opted, and the correspondingly high total of local eminentissimi co-opted over the same century can be drawn. For the period from Pius to Severus, the epigraphic evidence for proconsuls, while not much greater than that for the third century (26 texts cf.20)¹⁹ is of a type more conducive to mention of patronage, with the consequence that six proconsuls (all known from honorific statues) are recorded for this period, as against only one for the third century²⁰. As the evidence for lesser ranking administrators for the period 138-193 is considerably lower even than that for the third century²¹, we are little better placed in evaluating the impact of the expanding co-optation of local eminentissimi upon patterns of co-optation for group (A) administrators for this earlier period. Within the time frame under discussion (138-283), the only bureaucratic changes affecting Africa Proconsularis for which an increase in the number of group (A) patrons might be predicated, is the emergence of *curatores rei publicae* under the Severans. However, as has been seen (p.103), the available evidence suggests an overwhelming preference for co-opting *curatores* of local origo. (These officials and their family members make up 30% of all attested group (C) patrons in Africa Proconsularis). The rise of local eminentissimi as patrons, therefore, both mirrors the improving fortunes of African upper classes as a whole, from Pius onwards, and appears against a background in which the numbers of non-local administrators and officers co-opted, remained at best, static.

¹⁹ See list (D) (Second Century) at the end of the previous chapter. The asterisked references date between 138 and 193, and total 26.

²⁰ B49,50,52,60,61,67 (138-193),B89A(193-283).

²¹ Excluded from consideration are (1) all texts outside of Africa (unless erected by an African town) (2) all administrators of African origo (3) in the case of *legati procos. prov. Africae*, all texts where the *proconsul* is also mentioned. This leaves only four *procuratores* (C10570, 11048,12428 and 23068 - a textual lacuna may have referred to the latter's patronage) and no *legati procos. prov. Africae*. *Curatores* are not attested in Africa prior to Severus.

Those remaining group (B) patrons, who are little better epigraphically attested in this period than group (A) patrons, form a heterogeneous group, and require examination under four separate heads. These are (1) relatives of equestrians and senators, (2) Carthaginian *magistri*, (3) municipal *magistri*, *flamines* etc. and their relatives, and, finally, (4) patrons of unknown rank. List (C) - 'Group (B) Patrons; "Others"' - lists these sub-groups chronologically. It will be observed that less than half the total of 'Others' from proconsular Africa (16-21/45) can be assigned to the period 138-283.

FIRST SUB-GROUP

Members of the first sub-group fall neatly into two types, those from Thugga, four in number, who all date prior to the reign of Marcus, and those from elsewhere (also totalling four), who are all post-Severan²². Those from Thugga are all connected to equestrians holding municipal office in Carthage, but - with one exception - are fairly clearly not themselves of equestrian status, nor Carthaginian magistrates²³. The latter function was, as shall be seen further, pp.118-9, apparently at least as valuable an asset in the eyes of such communities as Thugga, which were attributed to Carthage (in *pertica Carthaginiensium*). The remaining four patrons of this sub-group, those from outside of Thugga, are all probably senators in three instances (B92, 118 and 133) and - with equal probability - of at least equestrian rank in the other instance (B189)²⁴. Four patrons from this first sub-group fall within our period (138-283),

²² (a) Thugga - B7,38,40 and 45 (B7, the only first century example, is actually a freedman rather than a relative of an equestrian. The inscriptions (AE (1969-70) 648-51) show him expending both his own wealth and looking after his master's affairs whilst he served in Carthage or abroad (e.g. rebuilding a fire-gutted temple on land donated by his master's grandmother (AE (1969-70)651)). It is possible that his patronage did not outlast his master's absence. When both appear on an inscription, the master (M. Licinius Rufus) giving a temple, and the freedman (M. Licinius M. l. Tyrannus) either meeting the cost or acting as curator, it is only the master who bears the title patron (AE (1969-70)651)). (b) outside of Thugga - B92 (Avedda),118(Uzappa),133(Utika) and 189(Uchi Maius).

²³ The exception, B45, is dealt with further below (p.117).

²⁴ B92 concerns the relative of an equestrian patron of Avedda, M. Munius Primus Optatianus (B91). Although not mentioned on the text of B91 (C14373), an honorific statue base to Optatianus, he clearly received a statue conjointly with Optatianus, since the text of B91 specifies that there was more than one recipient ('patronis'). The likeliest contender is M. Munius Primus Statianus, c(larissimus) p(uer), known from another dedication by the ordo to Optatianus, who is described as his father (ILA438).

B118 - the patron is mentioned only in passing on an honorific statue base to his son, described as '[i](uveni)] c(larissimo) patroni f[il(io)]'. The recipient's youth, and the reference to services to the community by both his father and grandfather, suggest that the father at least was senatorial.

but the high likelihood that three of them were clarissimi (B92,118 and 133) makes their inclusion in the total of 'Others' misleading, when comparison is trying to be established with attested senators and equestrians. Their removal, therefore, reduces the total of 'Others' to 13 who clearly fit the time frame 138-283, and another five who may. The sole patron of this first sub-group to be retained in our calculations, a certain Cincius Victor (B45) was father of a *vir egregius* and Carthaginian magistrate. No office is known for him, but he was evidently a person of wealth (to judge from his repeated benefactions), and one whose *auctoritas* may have extended to the capital even prior to his son's magistracies there²⁵. Even if not actually a Carthaginian office holder himself, Cincius appears to have been closely affiliated with those who were (not least his son), and ought, therefore, to be classed as an ancillary of the next (and most important) sub-group, Carthaginian *magistri*.

SECOND SUB-GROUP

Ten Carthaginian *magistri* are ranked among the 45 group (B) patrons labelled 'Others'²⁶. Another four Carthaginian *magistri* from group (B) were also equestrians (B17,22,39 and 46, all from Thugga) and two *curatores rei publicae* at Furnos Minus (C112 and 114, the former an equestrian), both patrons in group (C), also held Carthaginian magistracies. All 16 Carthaginian *magistri* are catalogued in list (E). There are besides five relatives and freedmen of Carthaginian *magistri* all from Thugga (four we have already seen, the other, a *princeps* at Thugga (B59) appears under the

B133 refers to *parentes* of a consul, or *patronus a parentibus*. The patron's consular rank, and the fact that both as *quaestor* and *praetor* he was imperial candidate, probably implies that he did not enter the senatorial *ordo* through *adlectio*.

B189 concerns the son of an equestrian patron (B188), whom the stone describes as C. Mami Ve[tti] Casti e.v., *patr[oni] filio*. The terms *p(uer) e(gregius)* and *i(uvenis) e(gregius)* are epigraphically rare, and we may assume by virtue of his patronage, that the son was not impeded financially from inheriting his father's status.

²⁵ This may be deduced from three hints in the text. Firstly, Cincius, although a local (note the expression '*republic(am) suam*') with estates at nearby Agbia (3 km. away), where the text was found, belongs to the *Arvensis* tribe of Carthage, not the local *Quirine* tribe. Secondly, the motive for his co-optation '*ad tuendam republic(am) suam*' suggests that Cincius had probably pleaded Thugga's interests in Carthaginian courts. Thirdly, the text makes no mention of any post either of Cincius himself or of his son. The latter's offices are only attested by an epitaph (C27420), which - interestingly - fails to mention his patronate of Thugga. The text's reticence may, therefore, cloak high office in Carthage, or even equestrian status for Cincius. Local office at this juncture is highly probable - note the donation of a statue to the *Genius Curiae*.

²⁶ B16,19,32,42,58,66,68,72,74,86.

next sub-group). Prior to the advent of their municipal status, for those communities like Thugga which were attributed to Carthage, entry into the Carthaginian burgess roll appears to have been at least as important a criterion for prospective patrons as membership of the equestrian ordo. Thus three of Thugga's five patrons, who were both equestrians and Carthaginian *magistri*, are known to have been co-opted, one (B22), prior to his only attested equestrian office (*praefectus alae*), the others (B39,66) prior to their actual adlection²⁷. Co-optation of the other two (B17,46) may also have preceded entry into the equestrian ordo. It is not known whether the parents of either were themselves equestrian, so it is possible that both were adlected to this status after serving as functionaries in Carthage. In fact, it is not even certain what the status of one of these patrons (B46) was, at the time the text describing him as patron was erected, details of his *cursus* being only known from his epitaph (see n.25). Although one equestrian from Thugga acted as patron without apparently holding office in Carthage (B57), he evidently owed his patronage principally to his services as advocate (he is described as '*advocatus eloquentissimus*' - ILT 1514)²⁸. Despite their status - an indication, perhaps, of access to higher levels of patronage (with

²⁷ B22. On an inscription describing M. Licinius Rufus as *flam. perp. Aug. c.C.I.K.*, his freedman M. Licinius M.1. Tyrannus (B7) is *patronus pa[gi]* (AE (1969-70)651). Rufus is not himself called patron, but then the context does not require it - he is mentioned only in connection with a plot of land given by his grandmother - and it is unthinkable that a community could co-opt as patron a master's freedman, without the master being himself patron already, probably with some undertaking whereby the freedman's patronage was relinquished whenever his master was not in *absentia* (see note 22 above). The text referring to Tyrannus' patronage dates to Tiberius (14-37) (AE(1969-70)651), that to Rufus' not till Claudius (54)(AE(1969-70)652 cf. 649 and 653, undated, but describing Rufus as *praefectus alae*, and so evidently later than the text describing Tyrannus as patron).

B39. A. Gabinius Datus filius is known as patron whilst only *flam. divi Titi Aug.* (in Carthage) (ILA569). Two other texts describing him as patron, give his later offices, including *equo publico* (ILT 1513, 1391).

B66. [-]us Gabinius Octavius Festus Sufetianus, Q.f. Arn., recipient of a statue by the *civitas* of Thugga, has been identified with an anonymous patron of the *pagus* of Thugga who bears similar posts (C26598 = ILA535 = ILT 1429 = AE (1904) 79 cf. C26624 = ILT1438). In the former text, Gabinius is recorded as *equo publico ornatus ab imp. Caes. M. Aurelio Commodo Antonino Pio Aug.*; in the latter, only as [*in quinque*] *d[ec]u[r](ias)adlectus*. If the identification is valid, adlection to the five *decuries* preceded that to the public horse, which also replaces the earlier title. C. Poinssot, *BACTH*, n.s.V(1969) p.236 has suggested the possibility that Gabinius was described as patron of the *civitas* in the later text. H.G. Pflaum ('*Les juges des cinq décuries originaires d'Afrique romaine*', *Ant. Af.*, 12 (1968) p.175) expands a textual lacuna to read - '*sacerdoti Aesculap[i] et Iovis, fl. perp.*', but there is room to take an alternative reading - '*sacerdoti Aesculap[i] et Iovis, fl. pp., pat.*'. This raises the interesting possibility that conferment of patronage by the *pagus* and *civitas* of Thugga may not always have coincided exactly in time, in this case, being later in the *civitas*. Erring on the side of prudence, Gabinius has been treated as a Carthaginian magistrate rather than as an equestrian (see list D, second sub-group).

²⁸ Another possible example (cf. IB122) dates after Thugga's promotion. It is possible that a lacuna in this text advanced other reasons for the co-optation of a person known only as *eques Rom.* He may have been an advocate, or held military posts or a curatorship. Co-optation of '*equites honorifiques*' was an uncommon phenomenon (see pp.251-2).

concomitant benefits to their client community) - equestrian patrons from Thugga can have differed little in prestige from the seven non-equestrian Carthaginian *magistri* which the community co-opted. The stocks of Carthaginian *magistri* were also high in other communities attributed to Carthage, three of whom elected these officials as patrons (Thibaris B72, Uchi Maius B74 and Chiniava B86)²⁹. The onset of civic promotion for those *civitates* dependent on Carthage seems to have diminished the appeal of Carthaginian *magistri* as suitable patrons, unless - as in the case of the two *curatores rei publicae* co-opted by Furnos Minus (C112 and 114) - they could serve the community by also occupying other, more influential posts. Prior to Thugga's promotion we can also detect a trend from the second century, of co-opting members of local Thuggan gentry who had risen to Carthaginian priest-hoods and magistracies, rather than of proffering the patronate to Carthaginians resident in Thugga, or those owning estates in the vicinity.³⁰ The wealth of these aristocratic clans from Thugga may be judged by their prolific munificence in the area, and by the few figures we possess for expenditure by office bearers in the capital, which indicate that costs on a similar - or even greater - scale were regularly outlaid.³¹

Whether their patria was Carthage itself, or the attributed *civitas* over which they enjoyed patronal rights, Carthaginian *magistri* occupy a special place in the hierarchy of municipal African patrons, by virtue of their contacts with the capital. Carthage

²⁹ Local senators and equestrians are also attested at Thibaris (B137) and Uchi Maius (B115,153,188) after their promotion to *municipia* or *coloniae*. Thugga is, however, the only *civitas* attributed to Carthage to record equestrians and senators as patrons before civic promotion (B17,22,39,46,57,145 (equestrians) and B55 (senator)).

³⁰ e.g. the *Gabinii* (B39 and 66), *Pullaienii* (B42), *Cincii* (B46), and *Marcii* (B58).

³¹ Benefactions include temples (B38-40) and an unspecified *liberalitas* (B66 - cf. C26625 = ILT 1439; it is uncertain whether the acephalous text refers to our patron) by the *Gabinii*; an unspecified building, and statue(?) by the *Pullaienii* (B42 - in Uchi Maius and *pagus Suttuensis*, but not Thugga, however - see C26267 = AE (1908) 265 = Uchi 36 and C26419 = Uchi 182); a portico and sundry other outlays by the *Cincii* (B45); and a Capitolium and theatre by the *Marcii* (B58-9; for the theatre, erected by the brother of B58, see C26606 = ILT1434 = D9364 and C26607 = ILT1435 and C26608 and C26528 = 1498 = p.1494 and C26528a = 15261a = ILT1405 and C26465 = ILT1388). High outlays by Carthaginian *magistri* 'ob honorem' dwarf those known for *magistri* from elsewhere in the province. Thus HS90,000 and HS50,000 were expended 'ob honorem aedilitatis' (ILA384 and C24640), as against a mere HS4,000 *summa honoraria* for the same post in Theveste (ILAlg13007), and Thubursicu Numidarum (ILAlg1223). Note also the HS50,000 spent 'ob honorem' (post unknown - C24644) and the *summa honoraria* of HS 38,000 for the *quinquennialitas* (ILA390). The latter may be contrasted to the HS10,000 established for the *quinquennialitas* at Hippo Regius (ILAlg110), and the HS3,000 at Thuburbo Maius (ILT714). Note too the lavish games given 'ob honorem' by the II vir *quinquennalis* Q. Volteidius Optatus Aurelianus at Carthage, costing more than HS 200,000 over four days (ILA390 = NB43), the most expensive on record.

afforded its magistrates enviable opportunities to establish bonds of *amicitia* with the provincial governor and other bureaucrats residing in the capital.³² Moreover, the city's importance and prestige doubtless ensured the frequent sending of delegations to Rome, and imparted an enhanced dignity to the delegates themselves, serviceable in the many rounds of introductions to higher circles. The consequent early adlection of Carthaginian gentes to the equestrian and senatorial ordines - for which scant but sufficient evidence survives³³ - thereby provided an expanding pool of locally based contacts with the central authority in Rome, to whom Carthaginian *magistri* could aspire to belong to, or at least tap into, to improve their own fortunes and those of their clients.

Of the ten Carthaginian *magistri* listed as 'Others', only three clearly fall within the parameters 138-283, two from Thugga (B58 and 66), and another from Chiniava (B86). Two others of uncertain dating within the second century from Thibaris (B72) and Uchi Maius (B74) may have been later than Hadrian. None are known as patrons beyond Severus (the latest example, from Chiniava, dates from 193 to 217), and the group forms only a small fraction of the 13 retained members filed as 'Others' for 138-283 (23.08%). However, the pivotal importance of Carthage upon its satellite civitates resulted in co-optation being extended to several relatives of Carthaginian office holders, two of whom (B45 and 59) are grouped among the 'Others' category, and date to our period. We may add, that the son of B45, an equestrian who held office in Carthage (B46), properly belongs at least as much to the Carthaginian *magistri* group as to the equestrians (see above p.117)³⁴. If cognisance is taken of these additions to the somewhat arbitrary boundary of non-equestrian Carthaginian *magistri* - as a true assessment of their impact on co-optation patterns within group (B) ought - it can be

³² cf. R.P.Saller, 'Personal Patronage under the Early Empire', Cambridge, 1982, p. 180.

³³ The earliest attested senatorial family are the Caecilii, whose first known member, Q. Caecilius Marcellus, was 'praet. in utroque honore candidatus divi Traiani Aug.' (C14.2498) cf. Tituli V p.716. M. Licinius Rufus (B22) was probably Carthaginian rather than Thuggan, and thus the earliest attested Carthaginian equestrian.

³⁴ Note also two possible relatives of Carthaginian *magistri*, B55, the consul M. Paccius Silvanus Coredius Gallus L. Pullaienus Gargilius Antiquus (related to Sex. Pullaienus Florus Caecilianus B42?), and B73 [-Gabinus ? C[?]emens Clodianus praised as 'defensor causae publicae' (related to the Gabinii B39 and 66?).

established that they form almost half of the retained total of 'Others' for 138-283, and for all periods.³⁵ Moreover, if our observations are restricted to Thugga, where the majority of co-opted Carthaginian magistri (all but three) are known, it can be seen that in relation to the time span involved, their numbers remain approximately constant either side of AD138. This is true, whether those of equestrian status are included or not³⁶. From the available evidence, therefore, it appears that the co-optation of Carthaginian magistri in Thugga (and presumably in other attributed civitates) remained unaffected by the improved prospects of adlection into the equestrian and senatorial ordines for Africans from 138 on. In Thugga, for example, two (B58 and 66) are recorded as having been patrons soon after the known date for the patronate of a local senator (B55, the consul M. Paccius Silvanus Coredius Gallus L. Pullaienus Gargilius Antiquus). The demise of Carthaginian magistrates as prospective patrons for communities 'in pertica Carthaginiensium' appears rather to have been the result of the promotion to municipal status of a steadily increasing number of such civitates. We may note, however, that these promotions were inextricably connected with the rise of local citizens into the equestrian and senatorial ordines, and their exposure to a widening circle of influential contacts.

THIRD SUB-GROUP

The number of local magistri, flamines and relatives ranked in the third sub-group of group (B)'s 'Others' category is somewhat more numerous than for those holding office in Carthage, both overall (14 cf.10) and for the period 138-283 (seven, cf. three

³⁵ 138-283 (6/14, including the equestrian B45 in the total). All periods (19/45, including the four equestrians B17, 22, 39 and 46). The term 'retained total' signifies the total of 'Others' less B92,118 and 133 for 138-283, and less these and B189 for all periods. See above (pp.116-7) for the reason for their exclusion.

³⁶ The date of the first known co-opted Carthaginian magistrate (B16) is 37-41. Five non-equestrians date before 138 (giving a period of 98-102 years) and two after (giving a period of 43 years) between this date and the latest possible date, AD190, for B66). The reference numbers are B16, 19-20, 31, 42 and 68 (42-138) and B58 and 66 (138-190). The difference between the fractions - 5 patrons/98-102 years and 2 patrons/43 years - is minimal (4.9-5.1% and 4.65% respectively). If equestrian Carthaginian magistri are added (3 prior to 138, B17,22, and 39 and 1 after 138, B46), the difference between the fractions remains roughly parallel (8 patrons/98-102 years = 7.84-8.16%, 3 patrons/43 years = 6.98%). The addition of related patrons brings the total before 138 to 11 (adding B7, 38 and 40) and after 138 to 5 (adding B45 and 59). The difference in fractions becomes even more minimal (10.78-11.22% and 11.63%).

which are certain, and another two which are possible)³⁷. They are, however, a disparate group. Textual lacunae may in four cases cloak higher status (B62,101,128,129)³⁸, whilst another in the group, L. Marcius Simplex Regillianus (B59), a princeps in Thugga, and a close relative (and co-benefactor) of the patron L. Marcius Simplex, who held office in Carthage (B58), ought more properly to be filed with the Carthaginian magistri. All of these five examples fall within the timeframe 138-283, leaving only two more or less certain representatives from this period for our third sub-group. One, B141 from Ureu, concerns a certain Q. Latinus Primus Puniscus, Latinii Feliciani II viralici(i) filius. The title 'II viralici(i) filius' implies that no higher rank for Latinus can be inferred, and both this, and the fact that no office is given for him makes it probable that he was still a youth, perhaps acquiring his patronage 'a parentibus'.

If Latinus was not yet of equestrian or senatorial status, such an advancement may not have been long in the offing. The similar name of a clarissimus praeses of Syria under Diocletian (Latinus Primus, C6.37118) makes it certain that he is connected to our patron, given the relative rarity of the name (only six Latinii are listed in the PIR, for example, and Latinus' cognomen is unique among senators and equestrians). The connection must have been close, probably within two generations, and no more than three, since the patron is clearly of a third century date. The conjunction of father and son probably suits best. The Latinii were evidently well-connected, and we may compare their rise to that of another third century gens from Ureu, the Octavii, who in

37 Local magistri, flamines and relatives (a) for all periods B1, 33, 41, 59, 62, 69, 101, 128, 129, 141, 169, 170, 199) (b) 138-283, B59, 62, 101, 128, 129, 141. Numbers B128 and 129, dated 161-324 are included as the terminus ante quem is likely to have been earlier than 324 (cf. H.G. Pflaum, 'L'Afrique Romaine', Paris, 1978, p.302 for the date of beginning - mid third century). On the other hand the filiation of B69 dated 100-150 makes it probable that the patronate antecedes 138.

38 B62. Sabratha. The relevant part of the text reads '[pat]rono II vir qq.[-]'. There is space in either of the lacunae (at the foot of the text) for more details of cursus. The enrolment of a mere II vir as patron at this date (175-80) in a municipium or colonia (the status is unclear, cf. J. Gascou, 'La politique municipale' (1972) p.82) is unparalleled in Africa.

B101. Thugga. The patron (deceased) is styled h(onestae) m(emoriae) v(ir). The title is normally the reserve of equestrians (see further p.127). There is abundant space for more details of his cursus in the lacuna of the acephalous text.

B128 and 129 Vallis. Both texts are acephalous, and as above, there is ample space in the lacuna for both the patron's name and other details of cursus. Both texts are very similar in detail, and the patrons may be related (B128 refers to a [II]vir(bis), B129 to a flamen perpet., duumviralis). The date (beginning - mid third century), and Vallis' municipal status, make it probable that their status is higher than that given.

three generations recorded a wealthy benefactor, an *egregius vir*, and a *clarissimus puer* (AE (1975)878-9 cf.880 for senatorial patrons from another branch of the same family.) Aside from one example at Furnos Minus (and here the patron was both *curator rei publicae* and Carthaginian magistrate - C114), Ureu provides the sole instance prior to the fourth century of an African community of municipal or colonial status co-opting as patron someone who was neither an equestrian nor a senator. This fact gives impetus to the view that Latinus' connections were beginning to work for him at the time of his co-optation, and that his prospects of social advancement were in the air. In short, Latinus was something more than *II viralici(i) filius*, whose position in the third sub-group must be given with reserves.

The remaining representative from our third sub-group for the period 138-283, B100 from Thugga, is likewise a relative of a municipal magistrate for whom no post or status is given. In this case, however, the patron [-Vib?]ius Minervian[us], is grandson of a wealthy benefactress, the *flaminica Asicia Victoria*, elsewhere described as *honestae m(emoriae) f(emina)* (C26593=ILA 534 = AE (1908) 163, see NB 121). The latter title makes it highly probable that her husband was an equestrian (cf. H.G. Pflaum, 'Titulature et rang social sous le haut empire', *Recherches sur les structures sociales dans l'antiquité classique* (Caen 25-26 Avril, 1969), Paris, 1970, pp.182-3), and it is quite feasible that Minervianus was himself an equestrian. The context of the inscription - the brief dedication of a statue to a relative - was not one in which descriptions of status or *cursus* form a regular component. Furthermore, the high rank of all nine other Thuggan patrons of known status, who date between 138 and 283³⁹ strengthens the likelihood that Minervianus enjoyed a higher standing than that which is actually known for him. Considerable doubt, therefore, attaches to his inclusion with the example from Ureu, the only other representative of the third sub-group for 138-283, and one in itself doubtful (see above).

With only four examples from our third sub-group known prior to 138-283, and only three after, one may wonder whether the co-optation of local *magistri* and *flamines* (for

³⁹ B45,46,55,57,58,59,66,101,145. Included are two relatives of Carthaginian *magistri* (B45 and 59).

whom a voluminous epigraphic record survives) was ever a frequent practice. In the early - and less documented - period, the examples concern two flamines (B33 from Bisica Lucana, and B69 from Thugga), the father of a flaminica (B41 from Thugga), and the probable brother of a libertus and II vir, Africa's earliest recorded patron (C. Pomponiu[s-], presumed brother of L. Pomponius Malcio responsible for the repair of the walls of Curubis after Caesar's African victory cf. C977; B1, Curubis). In Thugga, where the evidence for patronage is best, the only other local magistrates to be co-opted by the community, were either Carthaginian magistrates as well (B58 and 66) or were related to men who were (B38,40,59 cf. B72 ~~pat~~ Thibaris). From our fourth sub-group, however (i.e. those whose status is unknown), a sizeable proportion (5/14 or 35.71%) are Thuggan⁴⁰, and in three cases (B13,32,36) - where status is omitted, rather than absent in a textual lacuna - it does not seem as if the individual concerned was of a particularly elevated rank. None - and this is important - post-date the first century⁴¹; a fact we may connect to the improving status of Thugga's élite, as witnessed by the trend towards co-opting locals - as opposed to Carthaginians - who held Carthaginian magistracies from the second century onwards. It would, therefore, seem that the flamen (B69), and the father of a flaminica (B41) from Thugga, whose patronage does date to the second century, albeit early, represent the last examples of persons of such limited influence beyond their locality having received the honour, until what appears to have been a fourth century renaissance (cf. B169,170,199). Moreover, as we shall see (pp.136-41), even patrons of this relatively low calibre may well have borne an *auctoritas* not to be measured by their actual status.

The two remaining early examples from the third sub-group concern communities of greater importance than Thugga, whose patrons are both earlier and more fortunate in

⁴⁰ B13,32,36,73 and 75. See below (p.136) for more detail.

⁴¹ Note, however, that two persons of unknown rank are found in Thugga at an indeterminable date in the second century. One (B73), a *defensor causae publicae*, was clearly a person of some prestige, possibly an equestrian advocate (cf. B57), and/or Carthaginian office holder. As with the second example (B75), a lacuna may have revealed details of rank. Nothing can be adduced from the second example to establish whether the anonymous patron was merely a local magistrate, or a person of higher station. In the first example, however, the *defensor causae publicae* is very probably a Gabinius, and hence related to the equestrian and Carthaginian office holder, A. Gabinius Datus filius (B39).

the importance of their circle of contacts. Curubis - a vital base in Caesar's *bellum Africum* - was to become a colony within a year or two of the erection of the bronze *tabula* to C. Pomponius. Pomponius was clearly a Caesarian, to judge from his (presumed) brother's position as *II vir* at the war's end. Some service by Pomponius may be reckoned to have earned him the simultaneous regard of both *patria* and dictator, the latter's favour being probably a crucial factor in the decision to co-opt him. Caesar could scarcely countenance as patron, at this critical juncture, a person in whom he did not have the fullest confidence.

The second community, *Bisica Lucana*, a *municipium* under Hadrian, some 70-80 years before Thugga's promotion, had as its first recorded patron, Q. Ennius E[p]pillus (B33) in c86. Ennius was not only a local *flamen*, but a centurion in the third Augustan legion (still stationed in *Africa Proconsularis* at Theveste), and thus enjoyed a certain access to an imperial official directly concerned with African affairs. Ennius appears to have been the founder of his family's fortunes, since another Ennius, P. Ennius Saturni[n]us Karus of the same tribe, and clearly a descendant, was inscribed in the *amplissimus ordo*, and was also patron of *Bisica Lucana* sometime between 117 and 235 (B125)⁴². Neither Pomponius nor Ennius are therefore typical municipal magistrates (or relatives thereof). All the other examples of local magistrates and relatives (as also of persons of unknown status) before Pius are those already discussed from Thugga⁴³.

⁴² A. Beschtaouch, 'Éléments celtiques dans la population du pays de Carthage', *CRAIBL*, 979, p.402-3 (cf. *AE* (1979) 657) (followed by M. Corbier, *Tituli V*, pp.710-11) considers Saturninus to have been the grandson of a brother of Epillus, the veteran P. Ennius Paccianus, T.f. Epilli n. Qui. (C792 = 12241), whose son was a T. Ennius (Saturninus gives his filiation as T.f.). The scenario, while plausible, is not certain. Saturninus' praenomen does not necessarily secure his lineage from Paccianus (both are *Publii*). Descent from Paccianus' brother, the patron Epillus, cannot be discounted. He does at least have the virtue of sharing with Saturninus the patronage of *Bisica Lucana*, which, the latter indubitably inherited 'a parentibus'. On the other hand, a lacuna at the end of the text set up by Paccianus, may have noted that he too was co-opted at *Bisica Lucana*. Whoever was Saturninus' linear ancestor, Epillus or Paccianus, the chronological parameters of the text in which Saturninus is made known (*AE*(1979)657) allow for him to have been further removed than grandson, by as many as three generations. The *terminus post quem* is AD117-38, by *Bisica Lucana*'s municipal status (Hadrian's promotion is confirmed by an unpublished text cited by Beschtaouch, *op. cit.*, p.403, and J. Gascou, 'La politique municipale de Rome en Afrique du Nord', *ANRW*, 10,2, p.185 n.292). The *terminus ante quem* is Saturninus' post of *aedilis curulis*, not attested after Severus Alexander (cf. J. Gascou, *op. cit.*, p.282-3 and G. Barbieri, 'L'albo senatorio da Settimio Severo a Carino (193-285)', *Roma* (1952) p.346 n.2007). A. Beschtaouch, in line with his view that Saturninus was grandson of Paccianus, ascribes the date to the 130's.

⁴³ Municipal magistrates and relatives - B41, 69. Persons of unknown status - B13,32,36.

The case of Thugga, with its high incidence of patrons of relatively low status, may nevertheless be taken as probably typifying the co-optation patterns for African civitates and pagi before Pius. This is so, partly because the lack of evidence for other civitates and pagi reflects the meagreness of our sources for municipal magistrates in the early period, and partly because Thugga, with its long history of dependence on Carthage, its modest dimensions, and its slow rise to municipal status, was quite unexceptional amongst the numerous civitates and pagi 'in pertica Carthaginiensium', except in its voluminous epigraphic remains. The degree to which Thugga is typical, is, however, an issue at once contentious and pivotal to an appreciation of the patronal 'system' in early Roman Africa. Discussion must therefore interrupt the equally thorny issue of the debatable rôle of the fourth sub-group.

THUGGA

To recapitulate, Thugga records 13 patrons in all, prior to Pius, ascribed to the 'Others' category. Of these, five are Carthaginian magistri (B16,19-20,31,42,68), and three others are connected to other Carthaginian magistri (B7, the freedman M. Licinius M.1. Tyrannus, and B38 and 40, two flamines, the father and brother of A. Gabinius Datus). The remainder comprise a flamen (B69), the father of a flaminica (B41) and three others (B13,32 and 36) of unknown rank, who are unlikely to have attained equestrian or higher status. Thereafter, the only patrons from Thugga grouped in the 'Others' category are either Carthaginian magistri (B58 and 66) or close relatives (B45 and 59) - all for the period 138-93; or probable equestrians (B100 and 101)⁴⁴ who date a little later (c193-205). Finally, at an indeterminate date in the second century are firstly, a defensor causae publicae (B73), presumably an advocate, and if not himself an equestrian and/or Carthaginian magistrate, probably related to A. Gabinius Datus filius who was, and secondly, an anonymous benefactor (B75), for

⁴⁴ B100 the grandson of an h(onestae) m(emoriae) f(emina) has already been discussed (p.123). Whilst B100 was presumably the grandson of an equestrian, B101 an anonymous flamen, was, as an h(onestae) m(emoriae) v(ir), likewise probably himself of equestrian rank, and this may indeed have been mentioned in a textual lacuna. Carthaginian magistracies for both are likely, if their presumed equestrian status was 'honorifique' (cf. above n.28).

whom no assessment of status is possible⁴⁵. The evidence appears to indicate that in Thugga, a move away from co-opting persons of primarily local influence established itself in the early second century, and that purely local magistrates (other than those connected to Carthaginian *magistri*) ceased to be co-opted here by the reign of Pius (or at the latest Marcus)⁴⁶. On the other hand, Carthaginian *magistri* are recorded as patrons as late as the reign of Commodus (B66). Apart from those seven Carthaginian *magistri* already mentioned as patrons (B16,19-20,31,42,58,66,68) and their five cognates (B7,38,40,45,59), four of the six remaining patrons of Thugga outside of the 'Others' category (B17,22,39 and 46), all of whom were equestrians, also occupied Carthaginian magistracies. We can hardly doubt that the two other patrons of Thugga outside of the 'Others' category, an equestrian advocate (B57) and a senator of consular rank (B55), were intimately associated with the capital, even if not magistrates themselves. The latter, M. Paccius Silvanus Coredius Gallus L. Pullaienus Gargilius Antiquus, Q.f., is clearly a connection of Sex. Pullaienus Florus Caecilianus Sex. f. Arn. (B42), patron of Thugga and magistrate in Carthage a generation earlier.

As we have seen (p.119) there is some reflection of the prominent part played by Carthaginian *magistri* as patrons at Thugga in other civitates attributed to the capital (B72,74 and 86), although the practice is nowhere known for attributed civitates after their promotion, even though several attest the liberalities of Carthaginian *magistri*⁴⁷. Two of the three civitates, other than Thugga, with Carthaginian *magistri* as patrons, Uchi Maius and Thibaris, both less than 15 km. by air from Thugga, record local equestrians and a senator respectively as patrons after their advancement to

⁴⁵ See above, n.41.

⁴⁶ The co-optation of Cincius Victor (B45) in 139-61, preceded that of his son's (B46). It is not known whether Victor's son (or Victor himself - see above p.117) held equestrian rank or Carthaginian magistracies at this date.

⁴⁷ e.g. Avitta Bibba (C805), construction of a portico in 149.

Thuburbo Maius (ILA238), construction of a temple in 138-61.

Thibaris (ILA512), daughter awarded statue by ordo 'ob merita patris' in 228. Bisica Lucana (12318), awarded statue by ordo in 168. cf. Carthaginian *magistri* acting as benefactors in civitates, who do not appear to have been patrons e.g. Numluli in 170 (C26121), Saradi in 160 (C23820), Uccula in 117-61 (C14364).

municipia⁴⁸, but no patrons are likewise indicated for the municipium or colonia of Thugga.

For C. Poinssot, the 'curieuse coincidence' of the cessation of evidence for Thugga's patrons just at the moment of Thugga's promotion, and after two centuries in which the patronate is so well documented, is to be explained by the possibility that Thugga's patrons are simply *magistri pagi* under a more flattering appellation⁴⁹. This novel theory, in turn, rests on the complete absence of these officials from Thuggan epigraphy, in contradistinction to their attestation in six other communities in proconsular Africa⁵⁰. The title 'patronus', insofar as it designated a simple magistracy, would, therefore, have fallen into abeyance with the other pre-Roman titles for magistracies (*sufes*, *undecemvir*, etc.) as soon as municipal status was formalised. On the other hand, patronage of the 'type classique' could well have operated in Thugga, as elsewhere, after 205 in Poinssot's view (a view for which there is considerable circumstantial, if not concrete evidence).⁵¹ Poinssot's theory is attractive, in that it simultaneously explains the non-appearance of *magistri pagi* in Thugga with the voluminous record for patrons - which far exceeds that of any other proconsular African community, bar *Lepcis Magna* - but nevertheless is ultimately difficult to accept.

⁴⁸ Uchi Maius - B115,153,188 (the status of another three is unknown B154,189,190), Thibaris - B72.

⁴⁹ C. Poinssot, 'M. Licinius Rufus patronus pagi et civitatis Thuggensis,' *BACTH*, n.s.V(1969) p.238.

⁵⁰ *Magistri pagi* appear in *pagus Minervius* (C25423), *Belalis Maior* (AE(1978)854-5), *Uchi Maius* (C26250,26252), *Thibaris* (C26185), *Tituli* (C27828) and *Djebel Mansour* (AE(1977)855). For other *magistri* in *Africa Proconsularis* cf.

(a) *civitates* (1) *Vazi Sarra* (C12004), (2) *Biracsaccar* (C23876), (3) *Gori* (C12421), (4) *Furnos Minus* (C25808).

(b) *fundi* (1) *f(un)d(us)?* (C11217), (2) *fundus [-] itanus* (C23022), (3) *fundus Tapp (-)* (ILT628).

(c) *vici* (1) *vicus Annaeus* (ILT778).

(d) *salti* (1) *saltus Burunitani* (C14464).

(e) communities whose status is not given (1) *(castellum?) Ma[-] rensium* (see C. Lepelley, 'Les cités, II pp.139-40, for the view that the community was a *castellum* rather than a *pagus*),

(2) *Vina* (AE(1961)199 (*civitas* or *pagus*, cf. P. Veyne, 'Deux inscriptions de Vina', *Karthago*, IX (1958) p.109), (3) *Zitha* (ILA12), (4) *Aïn Nechma* (ILAlgI471), (5) *Aïn Souda* (ILAlgI928), (6) *Hr. Koudiat Setieh* (ILAlgI950, 951), (7) *Pichon* (ILA82).

⁵¹ *ibid.* and cf. *ibid.*, n.85, where Poinssot suggests A. Vitellius Honoratus (C26582) and Mummius Faustianus (*ined.*) as candidates. The former appears unlikely - his patronage would surely have appeared on the detailed statue base erected to him by the *ordo*. On the other hand, four lacunary texts may conceal patrons. ILT1420 may read '[pat(ronis) e]t curato[ribus]', whilst either '[pat(rono)]' or '[cur(atore)]' must have preceded '[s]plendidissimi mu[nicipii]' and 'splendidissimae col. Thugg.' in C26581 and 26601 respectively. The equestrian recipient of a statue erected by the *ordo*, may again have been described as '[pat(rono)]' in his *cursus*.

Firstly, we may discount the low status of two of Thugga's patrons, M. Licinius M.1.Tyrannus and L. Postumius Chius, C.f.Arn (B7 and 13) as supportive of Poinssot's case. As patron, Tyrannus may well have simply acted as deputy, while his master served abroad, relinquishing the title and its obligations with his master's return (see above n.22). Even if this were not so, there is comparative Italian evidence for the existence of *liberti* as patrons in the early period⁵². On the other hand, the assignation to Chius of the status of 'très probablement fils d'affranchi' is unwarranted⁵³. The assumption is based on Chius' Greek cognomen, but Greek cognomina, while infrequent in Africa Proconsularis, occur a dozen times, for example, in Duncan-Jones' list of African equestrians, and twice that number (24) are known for local magistrates⁵⁴. While Greek or Oriental background may be surmised in some cases, this need not necessarily imply that that background was also servile. More importantly, those few Thuggan texts which permit us to see the motivation behind a patron's co-optation, all indicate that the person involved had expressly protected the city's interests by legally representing his client. Thus, Q. Calpurnius Rogatianus (B57) is eulogised as 'patronus et advocatus el[loquentis]simus', and [-Gabinus?Cl]emens Clodianus as 'patronus et defensor causae publicae' (B73), whilst [-]Cincius Victor, who specifies that he was created patron 'ad tuendam rempublic(am)' (B45), indubitably also acted for his patria in the courts. We may also note the legal experience of three other patrons who served on the five decuries (B39,58,66), and the lacunary text in honour of a senator described as '[def]ensor immunitatis perticae Carthaginiensium' (AE(1963)94), whose patronate we may well credit with C. Poinssot (op. cit., p.299) as being 'sans doute'. Such activities do not

⁵² Three are cited by R. Duthoy, op. cit., p.128.

⁵³ op. cit., p.256.

⁵⁴ R. Duncan-Jones, 'Equestrian Rank in the Cities of the African Provinces under the Principate : an Epigraphic Survey', PBR, XXXV (1967) n.3,7,32,36,79,149,164,172,196,210,217,220. Decuriones and flamines with Greek cognomina - Alexander (C978), Amanus (AE(1957)74), Ampelio (C12318), Apollonides(IRT590), Aristo (C5.4921), Athenaeus (C26255), Auge(C12067), Cale(C14690), Cosminus(C24017), Daphnus(ILA228), Demetrianus(C76), Diophantus(ILA254), Draco(C22710,227378), Heracla(AE(1977)855), Hermes(C16368), Luciscus(C16417), Pancratius(C24003), Perseus(C997), Philome[lus? vel-tor?] (C14452), Phi[loxenus](C25955), Sofenia(ILA12224), Thallianus(ILA11344). Greek signa are excluded. Note that Postumius Chius' tribe Arnensis, marks him out as a citizen of Carthage, where a sizeable population of veterans and negotiatores from the East may be presumed to have settled.

appear to belong to the sphere of duties proper to *magistri pagi*, who in the present confines of surviving Proconsular African epigraphy are known principally either as dedicating officials of publicly erected monuments, or as benefactors '*ob honorem magistrati*' (see list (G)2). On the other hand, the emphasis which Fronto places on expertise at the bar (*Ad Amicos* II ii, see pp.56-8) in his advice to the decurions of Cirta, upon whom to approach as patrons, is a strong indicator that the ability to render such service was one of the more important criteria a prospective patron was commonly expected to be able to meet. Indeed, two apparent testimonials to this sort of legal protection by group (B) patrons are known for Numidia.⁵⁵ Again, with one exception, none of the known *magistri pagi* indicate that they were also bearers of Carthaginian magistracies and/or held equestrian or senatorial status, as do virtually half of Thugga's patrons (13 out of 27, with another five collaterals of Carthaginian *magistri* and two or three probable equestrians).⁵⁶

The sole example of a *magister pagi* exhibiting a *cursus* in Carthage derives from Thibaris, c20 km. N.W. of Thugga. The *magister*, L. Cornelius Maximus, P.f. Arn., who occupied four magistracies and priesthoods in the capital, was also, significantly, patron of Thibaris (B72). The post of *magister pagi* was the first and least important in his *cursus*, and a span of as much as a decade may have intervened between his

⁵⁵ (1) B235 at Diana Veteranorum - '*in omnibus negotiis exsimia fide tutosdefensos fov[et?-it?-eret?]*'.

(2) B241 at Thamugadi - '*erga civeis patriamque prolixo cultori exercitiis militaribus effecto, multifariam loquentes litteras ampliandi, Atticam facundiam adaequant Romano nitori ordo incola fontis patrono oris uberis et fluentis nostr[o] alteri fonti.*'

(1) The normal inference from '*defensos*' is that of a legal nature (cf. M.G. Jarrett, op. cit., p.151 citing RE, IV 2365 ff., *defensor civitatis*) and this impression is strengthened by the context ('*omnibus negotiis*').

(2) No explicit connection is made between the patron's oratorical pretensions and his position as patron, but it is a likely assumption that his volubility was of service to the community. Intimacy with the emperor and his circle - the patron had a distinguished senatorial career - may have facilitated such addresses as were made before the emperor.

⁵⁶ Excluded from consideration is ILT1367 from Gillium. The text reads D.M.s.L. Caninius Ianuarius Flavianus d(ecurio)K(arthaginis),eq(ues)R(omanus), a mi(litiis) MAG SAG pius [vixit annis-]. H.G. Pflaum, '*L'Afrique Romaine*', Paris (1976), p.304 (contra M.G. Jarrett, '*An Album of the Equestrians from North Africa in the Emperor's Service*', Ep. Stud., IX (1972) p.166 n.36, who reads '*mag. [pag.]*' and L. Poinssot, ILT1367 add., who reads either '*mag. [pag.]*' or '*mag(ister pagi), sa[c(er)dos]*'), notes another possibility for the odd MAG.SAG., viz. '*mag(ister) sa[c(rorum)]*'. This eliminates the unlikely mason's error of S for P. The post was presumably identical to the high Carthaginian priesthood *magister sacrorum Cerealiu(m)* (or *Cereru(m)*) attested in Furnos Minus by 2 *curatores rei publicae* (one an equestrian) (C 25808b-c, and cf. ILA 390 in Carthage for [mag.] Cer. sacror. held by a prominent equestrian Q. Voltedius Optatus Aurelianus). Like Voltedius, Caninius may have resumed a municipal career in Carthage, after terminating his service in the *tres militiae*.

holding of this post and his enrolment as patron⁵⁷. To L. Cornelius Maximus may be compared another Carthaginian magistrate exercising patronage over a community near Thugga, where the presence of *magistri pagi* is also attested. In this case, however, the patron, C. Marius Extricatus of Uchi Maius (B74), does not record that he had ever acted as *magistr^e pagi*. Clearly, within the bureaucratic strata of two of Thugga's close neighbours, *magistri pagi* and Carthaginian officials elected as patrons were differentiated, and were under different obligations. From the *cursus* of L. Cornelius Maximus, it is also apparent that the position of patron was by far the most prestigious.

If the lack of *magistri pagi* in Thugga⁵⁸ is, as Poinssot suggests (*op. cit.*, p.236), attributable to a more direct control over Thugga's affairs by Carthage than that exerted over some of her neighbours, a growing movement towards autonomy, discernible from the reign of Trajan (*cf.* AE(1963)94) saw this control gradually relinquished, until independence was finally achieved in 205. To the reign of Trajan belongs the dedication to the *defensor immunitatis perticae Carthaginiensium* mentioned above, and in 167-8 an imperial beneficium granted the community the '*ius legatorum capiendorum*' (C26528b). We have already mentioned the strong likelihood that the *defensor immunitatis*, a senator, was patron, and the imperial beneficium of 167-8 may either have been attained through the services of another senatorial patron, M. Paccius Silvanus Corelius Gallus L. Pullaienus Gargilius Antiquus, Q.f. (B55), or those of the aforementioned equestrian, Q. Calpurnius Rogatianus, Papiria (B57), the

⁵⁷ Besides the *magister pagi* from Thibaris, only two other *magistri* from Africa Proconsularis mention any other post at all. Both are *magistri* of *civitates* rather than *pagi*. One describes himself as '*decurio et magistratus annualis civitatis suae Goritanae*'; the other, from Furnos Minus, whose *cursus* is entirely honorary, was '*fl. pp. sive XI p[rimatus] et mag(isterium) non administratum*' (see list (G)2n.21 and 7). *Magistri pagi* and other *magistri* are well attested in Numidia, in particular from the numerous *pagi* attributed to Cirta, and sometimes reveal other posts, but never attain any function outside of their own *patria* (*cf.* C6339, Uzelis, '*decurionatus et magistratus*', and ILAlgII4641, Thibilis, '*mag(ister) pag(i), flam. Aug.*'). The rôle of *magistri* as the equivalent of *aediles* is suggested by the description of two *magistri pagi* from Celtianis, Numidia (ILAlgII2095-6), as *magistri 'aediliciae iur(is) dicti(onis)'*, and by comparison of neo-Punic texts from Lepcis Magna - where officials subordinate to *sufetes*, known as *muhazim*, were later styled *aediles* - with a Latin text from the *civitas* of Biracsaccar, where a pair of *magistri*, apparently identical in function to the Lepcitan *muhazim*, are similarly subordinate to the annual *sufetes* (*cf.* P. Veyne, *op. cit.*, pp.107-8). Despite the relatively minor position of *magistri*, the post might be filled rather late in life. An epitaph from Sigus (ILAlgII6521) refers to a *mag(ister) pag(i) desig(natus)* who died aged 40.

⁵⁸For the exclusion of C27374 as a potential *magister pagi* from Thugga, see AE(1951) 75 and list (G)2 sub n.25.

‘advocatus el[loquentis]simus’. Both were patrons at about the same time (soon after 161 and 166-9 respectively’. The other evidence we have seen for the legal protection provided by Thuggas’ patrons is also all second century (B45, and 73, and cf. the adlecti in quinque decurias B39,58,66). Connected with Thugga’s growing confidence and independence vis-à-vis the capital is the regular fusion of the pagus and civitas in epigraphy from the reign of Hadrian, and the co-optation of Carthaginian magistri sprung from local, not Carthaginian families (see above p.119). While still conspicuous as benefactors in the second century (the repair of the portico of Ceres (B45) and the construction of the imposing capital (B58-9), for example), we no longer find Thugga’s patrons acting as official dedicators of other’s benefactions, as in the first century (B17, 19 and 32 respectively, in AD 42,49 and 85 (or soon after)). This activity is, in fact, unrecorded for any other group (B) patron and although frequent enough for group (A) patrons in their official capacity, it is also akin to the official dedications made by magistri pagi on behalf of their community⁵⁹.

Are we, therefore, permitted to concur with C. Poinssot, that at least for the first century, Thugga’s patrons were merely magistri pagi under another name? None are found representing their client in Carthage or Rome, whereas many of Thugga’s second century patrons, drawn from the most prominent local gentes, appear in the forefront of Thugga’s bid for greater civic privileges. Even if part of the function of magistri pagi was to represent the pagus under their jurisdiction in the capital, representation at this level cannot have been within their parameters, otherwise the need for neighbouring Thibaris and Uchi Maius to differentiate between magistri pagi and patroni is inexplicable - what other beneficia can their patrons - both Carthaginian magistri - have been expected to provide? The spirited succour which Thugga’s second century patrons afforded the community bears all the hallmarks of the patronage Poinssot regards as of a ‘type classique’, i.e. that conferred on influential figures who might be expected to ensure a favourable reception to appeals on their client’s behalf, by virtue either of their position (if an administrator), or their own

⁵⁹ See list (G)2n.8-19 and cf. n.23-24.

personal resources (primarily their access to powerful amici and patrons). Since we know so little of the functions and responsibilities of *magistri pagi*, it is always possible that in Thugga - in contradistinction to the situation in Thibaris and Uchi Maius - these duties were, from the outset, subsumed under the title of *patronus*. However, it is clear from the second century evidence that the activities of many of Thugga's patrons exceeded the requirements of a municipal magistracy, and were rather *beneficia* external to the obligations of any office actually held, and as such, the proper domain of patronal activity. In short, for the second century at least, whatever functions of a *magister pagi* a patron of Thugga also performed, they would appear to have been subsidiary in importance to the *liberalitas* expected of him in his rôle as patron.

The absence of evidence for this sort of legal defence from Thugga's first century patrons need not imply that this was never forthcoming. There is a general reticence in most texts to detail the more specific aspects of a patron's '*beneficia*', other than in such veiled terms as '*merita*', '*amor*', '*adfectio*' etc. Moreover, where status is given in Thugga for the first century, this is, in all but one instance, of a relatively high order, five patrons being Carthaginian *magistri* (B16,17,19,22,31), and the exception (B7), the freedman of one. Two of these *magistri* (B17, and 22) were in fact equestrian officers under Gaius and Claudius, and the first equestrians of any description attested in Africa prior to the late first century⁶⁰. It was, therefore, well within the capabilities of men of this stamp to assure by their own *auctoritas*, and that of their amici and powerful contacts, that Thugga's requests received attention at the highest possible level.

On the other hand, it is also true that the status of those who do not record it (B13,32,36) does not appear to have even reached the level of Carthaginian magistrate for the first century, and this tends to find confirmation in the existence of two patrons, the one described simply as *flamen* (B69), and the other known only as father

⁶⁰ cf. R. Duncan-Jones, *op. cit.*, p.152 and M. G. Jarrett, 'The African Contribution to the Imperial Equestrian Service', *Historia*, XII (1963), pp.211-2.

of a flaminica (B41) in the early second century (before Pius). There is also the case of three second century municipal magistrates or priests in Thugga (two flamines, B38 and 40, and a princeps, B59), who are closely related to Carthaginian magistrati, but here their co-optation may have coincided with, and hinged upon, that of their relations. Leaving aside these patrons with affiliations with Carthaginian magistrati, and restricting our observations to those five local magistrates and persons of unknown rank, not known to have been affiliated with Carthaginian magistrati - all of whom date before Pius - can they be seen to have distinguished themselves from non-patronal local magistrates in other towns (including magistrati pagi)?

Prominent expenditure in the town, as recorded for 12 patrons before Pius, and five patrons afterwards in Thugga⁶¹, while embracing equestrians, Carthaginian magistrati and persons of lesser station, was, of course, equally as much a feature of local office holders and other gentry not described as patrons. There are several notable cases of benefactions in Thugga from the latter group, the most impressive being the theatre erected by P. Marcius Quadratus, brother of the patron L. Marcius Simplex, who provided Thugga with its handsome Capitol⁶². On the other hand, with one unique exception (B36)⁶³, none of the benefactions of patrons are specified as being 'ob honorem', as is so frequently the case with local magistrates and flamines. It is apparent, however, from the lengthy inscription of Cincius Victor (B45), that a patron's benefactions, even when described as a 'benignitas', could be closely tied to the occasion of the conferment of the honour, as was normally the case with receipt of a magistracy or priesthood. Other patronal benefactions, most noticeably those of the Licinii (B7,22) and Marcii (B58,59), appear more spontaneous, whilst others again were promised for reasons we cannot determine (eg. B38-40 by the Gabinii and B41

⁶¹ Benefactors before Pius - B7,13,16,22,31,36,38,39,40,41,68,69.

Benefactors after Pius - B45,58,59,75,101.

⁶² C26606 (=D9364=ILT1434), C26607 (=ILT1435), C26608, C26528 (=1498) C26528a (=15261g = ILT1405), C26465 (=ILT1388).

⁶³ cf. C. Poinssot, *op. cit.*, p.239 'ob honorem patronatus est nouvelle dans l'épigraphie africaine'. The patron, L. Terentius Rufinianus, Adiutoris fil. offered a statue to Jupiter Victor Conservator, 'ob honorem patronatus civitatis suae Thugg(ae)', and gave three denarii to each of the decurions. Compare AE(1914)116 for an example from Dacia ('ob honorem patronatus').

by Q. Maedius Severus, the latter, perhaps, on the occasion of his daughter's flamine). Neither in scale nor in spontaneity, however, can the benefactions of a patron - of whatever status - be usefully distinguished from those of non-patrons⁶⁴.

Two different areas of investigation, on the other hand, appear to offer more tangible evidence to distinguish Thugga's early patrons of relatively low station from mere municipal magistrates. Firstly, the tenure of the latter magistracies, including that of *magister pagi*⁶⁵, was annual, while the patronate was an honour held for life. There is some evidence from Thugga that in this respect the patronate did not differ here from the norm. In the early second century, dedications to A. Gabinius Datus filius, describe him as *flam. divi Titi Aug. (in Carthage)* in one case (ILA569), but with the same priesthood, followed by several additional posts and the rank of *equo publico* in another (ILT1513). In both texts he is titled *patronus*. The former text is presumably the earlier by several years, and is so taken by M.S. Bassignano⁶⁶. By the reign of Hadrian, then, we can be reasonably certain that the patronate at Thugga did not differ in terms of its duration from the patronate elsewhere. A hint that this was also the situation earlier, is found in the testamentary gift to the *civitas* of Thugga by the patron Q. Vinnicus Genialis in 85 or soon after (B31), to whom we may compare another person, deceased, at the time of his epigraphic attestation, the anonymous *h(onestae) m(emoriae) v(ir)* of 205 (B101). In the wording of the latter, the implication is that the anonymous was patron at the time of his death, and as a '*patro[nus exemp]larius*', had presumably occupied the position for some years. Unfortunately, the text relating to Q. Vinnicus Genialis is only partly published, and it is not presently possible to construe whether he too was patron at the time of his death (and hence probably patron for some time), or had simply filled the post previously, as with other offices

⁶⁴ Again, the excessive generosity of P. Marcius Quadratus' theatre given '*ob honorem flaminatus*' is a case in point. See further at chapter XII p.312 ff.

⁶⁵ Cf. for example, the *magistratus annalis* at Gori (list (G)2 n.21) and the interesting series of dedications each Spring by *magistri* from Thibilis to the god Bacax, inscribed on the walls of the vast cavern known today as Grotte du Taya (ILAlgII4502 ff.).

⁶⁶ '*Il flaminato nelle province romane dell' Africa*,' Roma, 1974 p.117 n.6., who dates the flamine to Hadrian's reign '*se non immediatamente prima*'. Note, however, that the positioning of priesthoods in a *cursus* can be quite flexible, and it is possible that the flamine was first occupied after Gabinius' other posts, and that ILA569 provides only a reduced *cursus*.

mentioned in his *cursus*. Three of Thugga's early patrons (B7,22 and 69) are known from texts where they are not described as patron, but none of these instances can be held to support the view that the patronate was ever annual. One text (B69, C27369) is a simple epitaph, in which no *cursus* at all is attached to the name of the deceased (known also to have been *flam. Aug. perp.*). Another text is a dedication by two *liberti* 'pro salute M. Licini Rufi patroni' (B22, AE (1969-70)648), where again no *cursus* is provided or needed. Rufus appears on a second inscription, this time being described as *flam. perp. Aug. c. C.I.K.*, without mention of his patronate (AE(1969-70)651). His freedman Tyrannus - who is mentioned as patron - erected the text, but it is inherently improbable (see above n.22) that a community would elect to confer the patronate on a freedman before that freedman's patronus. Rufus is only mentioned at all, in connection with a grant of land by his grandmother to the Thuggan pagus, a context which scarcely requires mention of his patronate. The benefaction of Tyrannus on ancestral lands of his patronus, suggests that he is acting here as the agent of Rufus. Tyrannus' patronate seems to have been an honour accorded him while he represented his absent master, on the condition that he relinquish it on his master's return. This would explain the absence of Tyrannus' patronate on three other texts (AE(1969-70) 648,649,650), particularly AE (1969-70) 649, in which Rufus appears as patron with his full *cursus*. In sum, if we can read back from Hadrianic evidence (for which there may be support in the text of Q. Vinnicus Genialis of Domitianic date), the patronate was never an annual magistracy in Thugga.

A second aspect to consider in seeking to differentiate Thugga's five early patrons of relatively low status (B13,32,36,41,69), is that they may have wielded considerably more *auctoritas* than their position might suggest. We have already seen this in the case of the centurion and flamen from Bisica Lucana (B33), whose descendant (grandson?) was in the *amplissimus ordo*; and in that of the *duoviralic(i) filius* from Ureu (B141), the apparent father of another *clarissimus*. The prospects for the social advancement of the families of both men were no doubt very evident indeed to their contemporaries - one can well imagine that the prospects of small communities' more

favoured sons were perennial topics of conversation, on which everyone was (or pretended to be) well-informed. In Thugga's early period, the community not only sought out as patrons, Carthaginian *magistri* and their collaterals, but also, apparently, persons from local aristocratic families deemed by them to be predestined for greatness. We may divine this from the fact that in three of the five early instances of patrons from this milieu, not known to be Carthaginian *magistri* or collaterals, their families show equestrian members within two or three generations. As neither the names, nor the status of the children of these three patrons has come down to us, it is impossible to ascertain whether there is a direct linear link with these later equestrians. Even the links themselves are somewhat tenuous, being based on a shared nomen in two instances (B36 and 69), and a shared nomen and cognomen in the other (B32). This being said, probability dictates that within a small community such as Thugga's (population circa 5,000), most, if not all, members of the gentry with a common nomen would be related.

The fathers of the three equestrians are known in two cases, and surmised in another. At least one appears to have been the holder of some important official position, viz. L. Terentius Romanus, awarded a statue by the *populus Thugg(ensis)* 'ob aquae curam' (AE(1966)512), and C. Poinssot has suggested the office of *aedilis*⁶⁷ (in Carthage presumably). Romanus is the father of C. Terentius Iulianus Sabinianus, Pap., a *flamen* and *vir egregius* (AE(1966)512), and (apparently) a descendant of L. Terentius Rufinianus, *Adiutoris fil.*, a patron of Thugga, whose status is otherwise unknown - B36. The latter half of the first century(?), the date assigned by C. Poinssot to Rufinianus' patronate, may be too early - a date in the early second century would suit as well⁶⁸. A revised date would allow for the possibility that Romanus was grandson of Rufinianus. The conjectural father of Romanus, C.

⁶⁷ 'Aqua Commodiana Civitatis Aureliae Thuggae', *Mél.* à J. Carcopino (1966) p.780.

⁶⁸ No reason is assigned by C. Poinssot for the dating of this unpublished text, alternatively dated mid-end C1(?), and end C1(?) (BACTH, n.s. V (1969), p.230 n.8 and *Mél.* à J. Carcopino (1966) p.777). We may compare this date with one of the beginning to mid-second century (?) for another patron of the *civitas* of Thugga, who likewise uses the Semitic method of designating filiation by cognomen, not praenomen, (M. Calpurnius Faustinus, *Faustini Sidia[thones f.]*, B69 - cf. C. Poinssot, BACTH, n.s. V (1969) p.230 n.11 for the date. The text is also unpublished).

Terentius Iulianus, was proheres of a flaminica in 173 (ILA561 and C26529), and Romanus himself appears to have fulfilled the charge of 'aquae cura' in 184-7, when the civitas constructed at its own expense seven miles of aqueduct, the aqua Commodiana, whose substantial remains survive (AE(1966)511)⁶⁹. The manner in which praenomina are passed on, according to C. Poinssot's stemma for the Calpurnii, possibly militates in favour of a direct lineal connection between the patron and Romanus⁷⁰. Whether or not this is so, the Terentii certainly appear to have been among the most active and prestigious of Thugga's local aristocratic clans⁷¹.

Only two generations would appear to separate M. Calpurnius Faustinus, Faustini Sidia[thones f.], patron and flam. Aug. perp. in the first half of the second century (B69), from another patron of Thugga, Q. Calpurnius Rogatianus, Papiria, an equestrian, who owed his adlection to Marcus and Verus in 166-9, and whose services as 'advocatus eloquentissimus' have already been noticed (B57 cf. p.129). The latter is son of a Cal[purnius Vict?]or, [Pap.?), obviously not an equestrian, since his son was adlected, but possibly to be equated with the munificent Calpurnius (other names are lost) recorded as donor in 164-6 of the spacious temple known today by the erroneous Arabic designation, Dar el Acheb (slave market), and constructed at a cost of 15,000 sesterces⁷². Alternatively, the chronology would allow for the benefactor to be Victor's son, brother of Rogatianus. The patron Faustinus (Rogatianus' grandfather?) was also a benefactor of no little merit. His efforts in relieving a famine by reducing the price of wheat, earned him a statue erected by the grateful community in recognition of his 'eximia liberalitas'. To the Calpurnii may be justly compared other great aristocratic gentes of Thugga in the second century, the Cincii, Gabinii and Marcii, all with scions of equestrian rank, all producing several 'patroni patriae',

⁶⁹ cf. C. Poinssot, 'Aqua Commodiana Civitatis Aureliae Thuggae', Mél. à J. Carcopino (1966), pp.771-86.

⁷⁰ *ibid.*, pp.778 for stemma.

⁷¹ cf. C. Poinssot, BACTH, n.s. V (1969) pp.239-40, 'Terentii et Calpurnii seront, au cours du II^e siècle, au premier rang des 'illustres' du pagus et de la civitas Thugga'.

⁷² An unpublished fragment assigns the name Calpurnius to the donor (cf. C. Poinssot, BACTH, n.s. V (1969) p.240 n.97). For the nature of the building, see C. Poinssot, 'Les ruines de Dougga', Tunis (1958) pp.44-5 and compare R. Duncan-Jones, 'Costs outlays and summae honorariae from Roman Africa', PBSR, XXX (1962) p.109 n.113 and 'The Economy of the Roman Empire : quantitative studies', Cambridge (1982) p.115 n.45. It exceeded in cost all the eight other buildings in Thugga where prices are given.

and all celebrated for munificence on a grand scale. Unlike their contemporaries, however, Carthaginian magistracies would appear to be ruled out for the Calpurnii⁷³. On the other hand, the advocate Rogatianus is likely to have received his education in the capital, and his social advancement was almost certainly smoothed by contacts in Carthage, and perhaps abroad, established by the wealthy Faustinus.

The most illustrious second century equestrian personage to be connected with Thugga (if not actually himself Thuggan) is L. Marius Perpetuus, L. f. Quir., pontifex in Rome, promagister hereditatium, holder of five procuratorships, and the father and grandfather of consuls (PIR, M393). His presumed father, the homonymous scriba quaestorius proconsulis Africae, attested in a fragmentary text from Aunobaris listing officials in the governor's consilium (ILA592), was taken by Pflaum to have been a Roman from Rome by virtue of his office. ('Carrières', n.168 p.413). This view has been contested by A. R. Birley and M. G. Jarrett, who both subscribe to his African origin, the latter considering the matter 'irrefutable'⁷⁴. More recently, support has been voiced by the editor of PIR,M (see n.313), albeit tempered with caution. The African connection is in large part owing to the frequency of occurrence of the nomen and - more particularly - the cognomen in the province. Some relationship with C. Marius Perpetuus patron of Thugga in 89 (B32) - no other offices are known - seems probable. C. Poinssot ascribes his origo to within the pertica Carthaginiensium⁷⁵.

⁷³ Carthaginian magistracies appear to have generally been the prerogative of the Carthaginian citizens enrolled in the Arnensis tribe. Note that A. Gabinius Datus filius (B39), unlike both his father and brother (joint patrons of Thugga, B38 and 40) took on both Carthaginian citizenship and magistracies. His tribe is given as Arnensis, that of his father and brother, the Quirine tribe. Similarly, only the Marcii enrolled in the Arnensis tribe appear as magistrates in Carthage (cf. C. Poinssot, BACTH, n.s. V (1969) p.234 and H.G. Pflaum, 'Les juges des cinq décuries originaires d'Afrique romaine', *Ant. Af.*, II (1968) pp.161-2). Q. Calpurnius Rogatianus, who belongs to the Papiria tribe gives no indication in a detailed cursus that he had ever occupied a magistracy or priesthood in Carthage. On the other hand, there is the case of L. Iulius Crassus, L. f. Cor., a patron of Thugga, and a Carthaginian magistrate and augur (B17); and that of M. Virrius Flavius Iugurtha, M. fil. Pap., a decurion at Carthage (IC37) who were probably citizens of Musti and Thamugadi respectively. The difference in their case may lie in the fact that they were citizens of municipia, not of a dependant civitas, as was the case with Q. Calpurnius Rogatianus. Problems attach to a third example, that of [S]ex. Palpellius Faustus, P.f. Quir., holder of several Carthaginian magistracies, who is attested by a recent text from Furnos Maius (IB33A). It is uncertain whether Furnos Maius was a municipium at the date of the text (beg. - mid C2), or whether Palpellius resided in Furnos Maius, his tribe indicating that he was neither a citizen there or at Carthage.

⁷⁴ A. R. Birley ('The Coups d'État of the Year 193', *B.J.*, n.169 (1969) pp.276-7 n.209) shows that the post was restricted neither to Romans, nor Italians. The onomastic arguments for African origo (ib.) are very strong (cf. M.G. Jarrett, 'Album' n.99).

⁷⁵ BACTH, n.s. V (1969), p.239.

The family may have had estates at Aunobaris, where L. Marius Perpetuus' name appears on the list of the proconsul's officials, Aunobaris being a mere 5 km. from Thugga. The text is unfortunately acephalous, and only the (incomplete) list of names survives. The motive for its erection is, therefore, unknown, but it was evidently occasioned during a provincial tour by the governor and his entourage, although why the itinerary should have included a place as inconsequential as Aunobaris remains a mystery. The diversion was probably an official reaction to concerns either of the community, or an important individual within it, and these concerns may have been channelled to the proconsul through the good offices of Perpetuus, who was well placed to act as proxy on behalf of his patria, or a private patron. This is, it need hardly be stated, pure surmise. On the other hand, wherever Perpetuus' patria lay in the province, we may expect that his communications with it were regular, and that he was imposed upon, on at least some of these occasions, to promote the town's interests by whatever means were at his disposal. The proconsul's scribe is probably removed from the patron of 89 by two generations. Whatever the exact relationship may have been, we may be certain that the scribe's position on the governor's staff was due in some measure to the assistance of amici, or a personal patron with good links to the authorities in Rome or Carthage. These links may have been initially established by the patron. In this regard, we may note the existence of six Marii in nearby Uchi Maius, and in particular, a C. Marius Extricatus, C. f. Arn., patron of Uchi Maius (B74), and decurion at Carthage in the second century - perhaps a relation. Too many pieces of the jigsaw are missing to establish precise links between the earlier and later members of the Terentii, Calpurnii and Marii. Despite this, some sort of relationship between the patrons, the first attested bearers of the nomen, and the later equestrians seems certain, and if this is so, there must also be a connection - however much removed in time - between the patrons' wealth and influence, and their descendants' adlection as equestrians. The sort of wealth and influence which could set a family down this successful road, could also be used to good effect in promoting the welfare of their community and it is with this purpose in mind - rather than the

prospect of a generous outlay in return for the bestowal of an annual magistracy - that we must, in my view, interpret the conferment of the patronate. We may add that the relatively low status of the three patrons under consideration cannot be tied to their being (apparently) patrons of the *civitas* of Thugga only, as another patron of the *civitas* of Thugga, Q. Vinnicus Genialis (B31) - the only other known - occupied three magistracies and the priesthood of Ceres in the capital.

The two remaining patrons from Thugga's early period not known to have held Carthaginian office, are L. Postumius Chius, C.f. Arn. (B13) and Q. Maedius Severus (B41). The former, a patron of the *pagus*, was both a generous benefactor - he paved the forum and provided an altar, a temple of Saturn and an arch - and, as a member of the Arnensis tribe, a Carthaginian citizen. The combination of wealth and Carthaginian citizenship, entailing, we can assume, easy entry into the better - perhaps even the best - circles in the capital, appears to have been the decisive factor in his co-optation. Q. Maedius Severus, on the other hand, is known only as the father of a *flaminica perpetua*. His outlay on a temple of Fortuna Aug(usta) Venus, Concordia and Mercurius Aug(ustus) (probably on the occasion of his daughter's flamine) exceeded 70,000 sesterces, a generous gift and one which well surpassed the expenditure on another temple by the contemporary Gabinii, patrons of Thugga (B38 and 40)⁷⁶. Although virtually nothing is known of the Maedian gens, other than the existence of the patron and his daughter⁷⁷, the family's evident wealth, in conjunction with the relative lateness of the date (128-38), and the fact that Maedius was patron of both *pagus* and *civitas*, all point to the conclusion that Maedius was a more significant figure than this one text allows. Moreover, it has already been seen that the patronate was by this time at least, an honour held for life (see p.135 re A. Gabinius Datus filius, a contemporary).

⁷⁶ The temples of Concordia, Frugifer and Liber pater presented to the town by the Gabinii cost HS 50,000 plus (C26467-9).

⁷⁷ A probable relative, status unknown, appears on an epitaph from Thugga, L. Maedius Rogatus (C27011). No other African Maedii are attested.

THIRD AND FOURTH SUB-GROUPS: THUGGA COMPARED TO OTHER AFRICAN COMMUNITIES

The arguments given above have hopefully re-established Thugga's patrons as patrons in the true sense. It remains to be seen whether any significance attaches to the fact that so few patrons outside of Thugga genuinely fall in the third and fourth subdivisions of the 'Others' category before the fourth century. Excluding lacunary texts where the patron may have been of higher status (B62,128,129-see n.38), probable equestrians (B100, 101 - see p.123 and n.38), and one close relative of a Carthaginian magistrate (B59 - see p.122), the total of patrons from the third sub-group reduces itself to five, two from Thugga (B41 and 69 - see p.124), and three from elsewhere (B1,33 and 141). Of the latter, none are typical of the lower to middle range of local magistrates or priests. The patronage of one evidently enjoyed Caesar's blessing (B1, Curubis, see pp.124-5), and two others had as descendants, clarissimi viri - B33 from Bisica Lucana being perhaps grandfather or great-grandfather (see p.125), and B141 from Ureu, being, with high probability, father (see pp.122-3). The example from Bisica Lucana most closely approximates in terms of social prestige and less accelerated upward mobility, two patrons of Thugga, a flamen (B69), and a father of a flaminica (B41). The former, was possibly grandfather of an adlected equestrian, Q. Calpurnius Rogatianus (the advocatus eloquentissimus (B57) above p.129), the latter, Q. Maedius Severus, a person whose family is otherwise unknown, but one which clearly possessed considerable means (see above). All three texts belong to the period before Pius' reign.

The same early dating, and a similar background, apply to three patrons from Thugga already discussed (B13, 32 and 36), who belong to the fourth sub-group, that comprising patrons of unknown status. While their actual rank is unknown, it has been seen that two (B32 and 36) were probably ancestors of equestrians, while another was a wealthy Carthaginian citizen (B13). These three cases need to be differentiated from five other examples from the fourth sub-group prior to the fourth century, where the possibility remains that the patrons concerned were of high status.

This possibility does not appear to exist for the three early patrons of Thugga, who simply give no details about themselves, other than their patronate. Three of the five other fourth sub-group patrons occur in texts where lacunae may have deprived us of details of their cursus (B73 and 75 from Thugga, and B154 from Uchi Maius), while the remaining two (B126 from Bisica Lucana and B148 from Giufi) occur on brief dedications on statue bases erected to their wives and daughters by the *ordo*, a context where details of cursus were frequently not inscribed⁷⁸. Higher status for one of these patrons seems likely from his description as 'defensor causae publicae' (B73, see p.129), and R. Duncan-Jones has identified another, Aurelius Dionysius of Giufi (B148), with a homonymous procurator of Achaëa⁷⁹. Recently, however, J. Gascou has noted that there is nothing but the name - and this a relatively common one (he cites six examples from Dessau) - to connect the procurator with the patron⁸⁰. The identification is best left *sub iudice*. For the remainder, fragmentary indications of a *beneficium* exist for one patron (B75), while spectacles of an unspecified type are recorded for another (B154), but nothing which helps assess their social ranking.

Leaving aside these five examples from the fourth sub-group, and, from the third sub-group, both the patron who owed his elevation to the peculiar circumstances of the civil war (B1), and the presumed father of a senator, who may himself have enjoyed - or anticipated - a rank above that of mere *duoviralic(i) filius* (B141), a small residue of six patrons remains. These are characterised by being chronologically all before Pius, and socially from the upper strata of the local aristocracy, albeit not of the highest level, since neither they nor their family members appear at this stage to have held Carthaginian magistracies, or the title of equestrian. Five of the patrons had as their client, Thugga, the other, Bisica Lucana.

This low total is partly explained by the relatively low epigraphic yield from Africa before Pius. The dominance of Thugga, likewise partially results from the very high

⁷⁸ cf. R. Duncan-Jones, 'Patronage and city privileges; the case of Giufi', *Ep. Stud.*, IX 1972, p.12n. 5, citing C26604, 26605 and 26609, where statues erected to the brother and father of L. Marcius Simplex at Thugga by the *ordo*, give no indication of the status of Simplex himself.

⁷⁹ *op. cit.*, pp.12-16.

⁸⁰ 'La politique municipale de Rome en Afrique du Nord', *ANRW*, 10,2 pp.283-4.

epigraphic survival here, dwarfing that of all proconsular African communities bar Carthage and Lepcis Magna. Comparisons with other towns in Africa Proconsularis (excluding Tripolitana) where epigraphy attests local magistrates⁸¹ before Pius, reveals that far more of these texts (and of the magistrates themselves) are known for Thugga than elsewhere. Thus Thugga produces nine texts referring to 15 local magistrates (including five patrons) for this period, while her nearest rival (neighbouring Musti) has only five texts, in which a mere four local magistrates are mentioned⁸². Curubis alone has more than two texts referring to local magistrates⁸³ for this period, and more than four actual magistrates (compare list (F) for an alphabetic listing of all African communities where such references survive). On the other hand, Thugga's preponderance is not reflected, when comparison is made with Africa's other communities taken as a block. Inscriptions referring to local magistrates before Pius, are known for 34 communities besides Thugga, totalling 46 in all, and the total of actual magistrates is 61. The majority of these communities, like Thugga, had not yet acceded to municipal or colonial status (27 texts, 41 magistrates). Municipia and coloniae account for 15 texts and 16 magistrates, and communities of indeterminate status, four texts and four magistrates.

The failure of all 46 texts to produce more than two patrons (one if we exclude the patron from Curubis B1) is striking when Thugga's nine texts and five patrons are remembered. Even if comparison is restricted to communities of a similar low status (municipia and coloniae never - except in dubious cases⁸⁴ attesting magistrates (local or Carthaginian) as patrons) a yield of only two patrons (or rather one, again

⁸¹ For statistical purposes, local magistrates include all persons known only as patrons and exclude the curatores of official dedications. Also excluded are equestrians and immediate relatives of equestrians, holding local office, and magistrates at Carthage (including provincial priests). This narrow definition is intended to parallel as closely as possible other magistrates, with Thugga's five early patrons not holding Carthaginian office, nor related to those who were.

⁸² Thugga - C26517,26471,ILA558,ILT1509,AE(1963)94, AE(1966) 509, ined. (patrons B32,36,69). Apart from the five patrons classified as local magistrates (B13,32,36,41 and 69), 10 other local magistrates are known, six appearing in one text (C26517). All non-senatorial and equestrian magistrates in Thugga appear in list (D)2. Of the 12 names given for the period ante 138, deduct B7 and 9 (a collateral of a Carthaginian magistrate and a Carthaginian magistrate respectively) to arrive at the total of purely local magistrates. Musti - AE(1968)586,587,594,597,599.

⁸³ Nine magistrates from three texts. Five (four sufetes and a patron (B1) of unknown status) appear in one text (C10525).

⁸⁴ These are the lacunary texts from Sabratha (B62) and Vallis (B128,129). See n.38.

disregarding the patron of Curubis) from 41⁸⁵ recorded magistrates still requires comment (cf. Thugga's five patrons from 15 known magistrates).

The answer lies partly, it would seem, in the nature of the inscriptions themselves, and partly, it may be suggested, in the status of the magistrates. In Thuggan epigraphy, patrons below equestrian status appear on texts in the majority of instances as benefactors (12 examples), but also appear frequently as recipients of honorific statues (seven examples). They appear occasionally (two examples) as curators or dedicators of another's testament or benefaction⁸⁶. Thugga's five early patrons classified under the rubric local *magistri* appear thrice as benefactors (B13,36,41), once as statue recipient (B69) and once as the curator of a will (B32). Local magistrates prior to 138 from *civitates* and *pagi* elsewhere in the province, however, are primarily evinced on inscriptions as official dedicands or signatories, or as eponymous magistrates (16 texts, 31 magistrates)⁸⁷. In every case, bar one, the officiators bear the Punic title *sufes* - the exception concerns a pair of *magistri* at Aïn Nechma, (ILAlgI471) - and generally appear in pairs. No *sufetes* have yet been found as patrons, and the only *magister* ranked as patron - the *magister pagi* of Thibaris (B72) - occupied four Carthaginian posts between both titles. It has been seen (n.57) that the latter is the only *magister* from any of the African provinces to hold a post outside his *patria*. The situation is similar for *sufetes*, only one of whom, a *princeps* at Calama, attests any other post at all (ILAlgI290). *Sufetes* and *magistri* generally reveal themselves either on perfunctory official dedications, or as benefactors 'ob honorem', the benefactions being typically insignificant⁸⁸. The text from Calama is an exception - a large building apparently being involved - and the *magister pagi* of Thibaris who could afford the onerous expenses of four Carthaginian offices was evidently a very prosperous

⁸⁵ This total includes the patron from Curubis of unknown status, and needs to be reduced accordingly, if the patron is taken out of consideration (by virtue of the peculiar circumstances which permitted him opportunities of direct access to the dictator Caesar).

⁸⁶ See list, (D)3 'Inscription types of Thugga's group (B) patrons'.

⁸⁷ See list (G) 1(b).

⁸⁸ e.g. the statue by a *sufes* at Themetra (AE(1946)234) and by a *magister pagi* at Uchi Maius (C26250) given 'ob honorem'. Compare AE (1961) 199 at Vina and C25423 at pagus Minervius. At Thugga compare C26517 and AE (1966) 509 for *sufetes*.

individual. The outlay of another magister pagi in embellishing the Capitol at Belalis Maior, may also signify a prosperity well above the norm (AE(1978)855 cf. 854). In these circumstances, it seems unwise to preclude the possibility that such officials might have been co-opted in their own right (i.e. - anterior to some further honour - a post in Carthage for example). At present, certainly, the type of texts in which they appear, provide no satisfactory answer one way or the other, being all of a sort uncondusive to the mention of patronage⁸⁹.

The only other sizeable inscription type for local magistrates outside of Thugga prior to Pius' reign, comprises eight texts where various magistrates (three flamines, a magister pagi, a sufes, a decurion, an omnibus honoribus functus, and an aug[ur?]) appear as benefactors. The texts do not compare well with those from Thugga, where patrons are mentioned as benefactors, since only two of the benefactions are of any significance, and lacunae in both these texts may have expanded the donor's cursus beyond the level of local magistrate⁹⁰. The other six benefactions, pithily described, include statues, columns and an altar⁹¹. The donors were in all probability from the lower to middle rungs of the local aristocracy. None of their descendants are known to us. Men of this cadre are rarely, if ever, co-opted by African communities. While large-scale donations were never at any period the exclusive preserve of patrons, it is noticeable that virtually all the benefactions provided by Thugga's patrons are - where sufficient epigraphic detail survives - characterised by their munificence. The gifts of Thugga's patrons number many of the magnificent temples and public buildings still admired today, but also included such transient but costly acts of generosity, as famine relief (cf. B69). Again, where benefactions of patrons outside of Thugga are spelled out, these also appear to have been of an exceptionally generous order, the baths of

⁸⁹ Apart from perfunctory official texts (list (F) a n.2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25; list (F) d n.1, 2, 4, 9, 11, 13d, 14, 17) and equally brief texts describing minor benefactions (list (F) a n.11; list (F) d n.10, 13b, 15), there remain the statue erected to the magister pagi who eventually became patron of Thibarisis (B72), and two texts where large scale benefactions are recorded, but both are fragmentary and may have added other details of cursus (list (F) a,n.6a, list (F) d,n.3a, cf.3).

⁹⁰ list (F) a n.6a and 16.

⁹¹ list (F) a n.1, 7, 11, 19a, 21, 23.

Memmia at Bulla Regia, for example (C79), or the lavish spectacles put on by patrons at Uchi Maius (B154) and Thagaste (B179).

Two benefactions by Thugga's patrons, which may be described as minor, do occur, but are of an exceptional nature. The provision of a statue to Jupiter Victor Conservator, for example (B36), was specifically tied to the occasion of the patronate, being given 'ob honorem patronatus civitatis suae', while the testamentary bequest of HS10,000 to the community by another patron (B31), is the only legacy known for a local magistrate before Pius, and was presumably the last of many examples of his liberalitas.

The second most frequent inscription type for Thugga's patrons below equestrian status, viz. the honorific statue set up by the ordo, is located only once for a local magistrate of a civitas or pagus outside of Thugga before Pius, and the individual concerned is himself a patron, Q. Ennius Eppillus, T.f. Quir. of Bisica Lucana (B33). Although far superior numerically to the texts from Thugga mentioning local magistrates before Pius, the texts from other civitates and pagi in the province for the same period rarely conform to the inscription type where patronage tends to be mentioned⁹². Moreover, we may note that in the period before Pius, as after, generous local magistrates can be found who clearly weren't patrons. The clearest example of this comes from Thugga itself, where a local flamen, in his own name and that of five other family members, all with their local cursus cited, provided a temple (or statues?) to divus Augustus and Claudius (C26517). The length of the inscription, and particularly the detailed cursus, are manifest indications that none of the family of Iulius Venustus, Thinobae filius had attained the patronate, and a later descendant and flamen, Iulius Faustinus Honoratus was just as unsuccessful⁹³. We may therefore

⁹² cf. list (G)1 for a comparison. Inscription types for Thugga's ten local magistrates not recorded as patrons are also given. List (D)2(c) provides the names, offices, chronology and epigraphic references to all non-patronal magistri at Thugga. The list also includes Carthaginian magistri and collaterals (distinguished by asterisks). For the sake of completion, a list of all senators and equestrians from Thugga whose patronage is not attested appears at list (D)2(a) and (b).

⁹³ The text is unpublished (cf. C. Poinssot, BACTH, n.s. V(1969) pp.242-3 n.11). Two other Thuggan magistri (a flamen and a flaminica, list (D)2(c)n. 12 and 8) are recorded in connection with benefactions. Neither are known as patrons, but there is a long lacuna in the text of the flamen which may have given this title, and other details of cursus. The flaminica, Maedia Lentula, is in fact the daughter of a patron (B41). No women are attested as patronae in Thugga, but several clarissimae feminae are recorded from elsewhere.

expect, that in this period, a good number of texts in which local magistrates appear as benefactors would also include benefactors who were not patrons. The omission of patronage, even on a text where a local magistrate was responsible for a substantial donation, need not, therefore, signal that all local magistrates were excluded from co-optation by that particular town.

In conclusion, it is difficult to advance any reason why Thugga should differ radically from her neighbours in co-opting as patrons local magistrates whose star was rising - at least for the years before Pius. Bisica Lucana provides one parallel, and this was a community advancing much faster than Thugga (and the majority of average-sized communities) down the road to civic promotion. The gap in the record of other civitates and pagi for this period must ultimately be attributed to the paucity of our source material, not so much in its volume - although this is considerably lower than that of the following century - but in the fact that virtually all that survives is of a type inappropriate to the mention of patronage.

Proconsuls and important officials in Africa Proconsularis could not hope to assiduously distribute patronal obligations to the host of communities of comparable size and stature to Thugga. As a far greater number of these communities existed, than of those who might reasonably claim prior attention to the patronage of the governor or another high functionary, the example of Thugga would not have to be multiplied very often, for such high-level patrons to be numerically dominated by group B patrons in the early period, particularly as Thugga is documented as having two or more such patrons on several different occasions⁹⁴. If so, the dominance of

Patronage cannot be ruled out for another Thuggan, the legate Q. Marius Faustinus, Q.f. Arn. (list (D)2c,n.10) who is taken as a local magistrate. He was evidently an important person, to have been entrusted with so important a mission, but does not record any cursus. As a Carthaginian citizen (to judge from his tribe), he may have held magistracies in the capital as well (?) as in Thugga. He appears to have been an intimate of the anonymous senator, the defensor immunitatis perticae Carthaginiensium, to whom he erected the statue. The context alone suffices to explain why Marius' own (presumed) posts are not mentioned. It is also possible that Marius' full rank was given on a statue erected by the ordo out of gratitude for his legation, at the same time as that erected by Marius at his own cost (but 'ex d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)') to the senator. Assuming that the two statues were set up together, repetition of Marius' titles could be seen as superfluous. The only other Thuggan magistrate prior to Pius, for whom no patronage is known, is the *sufes maior civitatis* (list (D)2c,n.11) who dedicated a statue to Di Augusti (probably in an official, rather than in a private capacity).

⁹⁴ Thus patrons B16 and 17 date to AD31-41, patrons B31 and 32 to AD85, or soon after, patrons B38,39,40 and 41 to AD128-38, patrons B 45 and 46 to 139-61, and patrons B57,58 and 59 to AD 166-9 (with patrons B55 a contemporary or close contemporary).

local equestrians and senators as patrons in the later period, commencing approximately with Pius, was simply a continuance of a long tradition of resorting to influential local citizens as a conduit between themselves and the central authority, except that the pool of influential candidates for co-optation in the later period was far larger, and the candidates themselves, of more distinguished status, having in many instances materialised the prospects held out by patronal forebears. On the other hand, there is also the alternative option, attested only for two individuals, viz. that of small African communities seeking out minor equestrian officials of non-local origin as patrons (see A9-9c and 24). It is not currently possible to discern how widespread this resort was, or whether co-optation of such patrons ever alternated with that of local members of the aristocracy. The latter remains a possibility, even though none of Thugga's 27 patrons can count a minor official amongst their number, since instances of African towns electing to co-opt both important officials and local eminentissimi can be adduced⁹⁵ The frequency of conferring the patronate on minor officials - if frequent it ever was - may be presumed to have waned with the general betterment of status and prospects at the turn of the second century for the local upper classes of small African communities⁹⁶.

NUMIDIA

Earlier in this chapter, it was noticed that not only were Numidia's attested group (A) and (B) patrons numerically far fewer than their peers in Africa Proconsularis (group (A) 36 cf. 62, group (B) 17 cf. 109 - see chart (A) and p.107), but that this disparity did not affect both groups equally. In fact, the degree of numerical superiority of group (B) patrons in Africa Proconsularis is almost exactly reversed in Numidia. The inclusion of group (C) patrons with those of group (B) for both provinces, scarcely affects this disparity (see the figures below).

⁹⁵ e.g. Sabratha, where a local patron was co-opted in 175-80 (B62), and a clarissimus curator r.p. in 222-35 (A109); and Gighis, where a proconsul was co-opted in 159-60 (A52), and two local senators (B103 and 104) early in the next century (cf. also Bisica Lucana A67, B125, and 126).

⁹⁶ For minor officials co-opted as patrons in all the African provinces (including incerti) see pp.243-6.

Province	(A) Patrons	(B) Patrons	(A) Patrons	(B) & (C) Patrons
Africa Proconsularis	62 (36.26%)	109 (63.74%)	62 (31.31%)	136 (68.69%)
Numidia	36 (71.19%)	17 (28.81%)	36 (64.41%)	21 (35.59%)

The lower overall figure for Numidia's patrons, conforms to the lower epigraphic yield from the province in toto, in relation to that extant from Proconsular Africa. The far smaller degree of urbanisation in Numidia primarily answers the epigraphic deficiency both in general, and as regards the epigraphy relating to patrons. The dominance of imperial officials in Numidia as patrons, and in particular that of legates and their mid C3 - C4 successors⁹⁷, is in part a reflection of this under-urbanisation. Being fewer, Numidia's larger communities were ensured - as abundant epigraphic testimony proves - of the commanders' frequent contact, active involvement in municipal affairs and oversight of many civic as well as utilitarian constructions⁹⁸.

The strong presence of veterans in all of these communities further strengthened the bond with the commander of Africa's third Augustan legion, who unlike the civilian governors of Proconsular Africa, appears to have routinely been co-opted by the principal communities under his administration (see ch.IV).

While Numidia's legates and their successors do not monopolise the municipal patronate in Numidia, prior to the mid-third century, they appear only to have shared

⁹⁷ There are only three exceptions, all patrons of Cirta. The first concerns a clarissimus curator, M. Cocceius Anicius Faustus Flavianus (A248), the others L. Lucceius Hadrianus a v.p., rationalis (A256), whose administration of Numidia is far from certain (see p.54) and his wife (A257).

⁹⁸ See pp.88-9,92. Note also H. Jouffroy, 'La construction publique en Italie et dans l'Afrique romaine', Strasbourg, 1986, p.234, 'les légats de la III^e légion semblent avoir déployé une activité édilitaire remarquable dans le territoire placé sous leur autorité. Non seulement ils s'occupèrent des travaux de voirie et d'adduction d'eau, mais ils consacrèrent aussi des édifices civils', and cf. ib., p.280. There are even instances of legates, not of local extraction, privately contributing to the cost of temples and a piscinum at Lambaesis. These are

(1)L. Matuccius Fuscinus, who with his wife and daughter added columns to the temple of Isis and Serapis 'sua pecunia' (C2630=18100).

(2)[-Pontius]-, who with his wife and son added a monumental entry to a sanctuary of Aesculapius (C2585 = 18091 = AE(1967)571).

(3)C. Ulpus Pacatus Prastina Messalinus, who with his family ('[c]um suis') donated a piscinum to Aesculapius and Hygia (AE(1915)26).

this dignity with a small group of particularly prominent local, or locally based, senators. During the second century, all these persons (only six are recorded before 193, cf. 19 legates) had as their client either Cirta (and the confederacy), or the small neighbouring pagi and castellae where their principal praedia lay⁹⁹. They include such powerful figures as Hadrian's famed legate, Q. Lollius Urbicus (B213-3a); P. Pactumeius Clemens, descendant of Africa's first consul (B215-6); and C. Arrius Antoninus, a correspondent of Fronto, and - as is apparent from his brilliant succession of posts - an intimate of the emperors Marcus and Verus (B232). Over the next 50 years, between 193 and 247, an identical number of local senators appear as patrons, but most now derive from communities outside of Cirta, although one must imagine that the great senatorial families of Cirta continued to be actively sought out as patrons¹⁰⁰. Thibilis, where two patrons are known, did in fact lie within the vast territory attributed to Cirta. Both patrons, C. Iulius Pudens (B 236) and Vibia Aurelia Sabina (B240), are documented early in the period, under Severus, and it will be argued that the latter, at least, together with her husband Antistius Burrus, was co-opted earlier, under Commodus (pp.167-70). Thamugadi produces three senatorial patrons under the emperor Severus Alexander, P.Fl(avius) Pudens Pomponianus (signo) Vocontius, proconsul of Crete and Cyrene, and an adept in both the Latin and Greek tongues, as the text's florid laudation announces (B241); and two group (C) patrons, the Numidian legate, P. Iulius Iunianus Martialianus (signo) Leontius (C243a), and his son, P. Iul(ius) Iunianus Tironillianus (signo) Leontius (C244). The legate was also patron of Cirta and neighbouring castellum Tidditanorum, where other praedia are likely to have been held. Finally, there is the young quaestor C. Iulius Rufinus Laberius Fabianus Pomponius Triarius Erucius Clarus Sosius Priscus, co-opted at Diana Veteranorum, where he is honoured with a statue 'ob meri[t]a patris eius' (B235).

⁹⁹ Five C2 group (B) patrons of Cirta (B215-6, 219,222,223-4,232) date between 140 and 188. The sixth, Q. Lollius Urbicus, was patron of Caldis and castellum Tidditanorum in 136-8 (B213-3a).

¹⁰⁰ The number of non-local legates co-opted is actually less than that for local senators at this period (5-A237,238-8c,239,242,246), but two of these senators include a legate and his son (C243-3b,244). For potential senatorial patrons of Cirta and the confederacy in this period, see IB146,147,148,149 and cf.153.

In co-opting C. Iulius Rufinus, the *ordo* may have looked forward to services similar to those for which his father is extolled. From the context, these probably included legal defence of the community - 'singulos universosq(ue) in omnibus negotiis exsimia fide tutos defensos fov[et(vel-it, vel-eret?)]' - a rôle clearly to be anticipated from the three candidates put forward by Fronto, as potential patrons of Cirta, all of whom are described as men 'qui nunc fori principem locum occupant' (Ad Amicos, II,11). The 'eloquentia' possessed by each candidate in this regard (ibid.), will also recall the eloquence of Thamugadi's Vocontius - 'ordo incola fontis patrono oris uberis et fluentis nostr[o] alteri fonti'. His oratory was doubtless also used to good effect in his patria's cause. The ample capacity of Numidia's senators to represent their native city abroad was supplemented by the *auctoritas* which their senatorial status bore, and by the wide nexus of strategic contacts accumulated by the family. As patrons, their obligations - unlike those of Numidia's legates, whose *origo* lay outside of the province - were both permanent and personal. Local senators were also of course, by virtue of their wealth and position, members of their communities' most powerful families, who would tend to regard municipal patronage as a natural inheritance, and there is evidence from Africa and Italy to suggest that their expectations were normally met (see pp.200-1).

Prominent citizens beneath senatorial rank are known to have been co-opted with more scrutiny than local senators in Africa Proconsularis, as can be gauged by the pronounced increase in the percentage of local citizens honoured with statues by the *ordo*, who are not styled patrons, as one descends the social scale (see pp.251-2). In Numidia, the particularly close working relationship the legate enjoyed with this province's fewer larger communities, and the beneficial rôle played by the army, may have obviated the need to extend the patronate to citizens outside the powerful senatorial élite until the mid-third century. The Numidian experience would, then, contrast directly with that of her neighbours. In Africa Proconsularis, certain better documented communities (e.g. Thugga and Bisica Lucana) indicate what may have been the provincial pattern, viz. a discernible - if erratic - shift away from co-opting

local magistrates, to the co-optation of magistrates at Carthage, and/or equestrians, with local senators inevitably, and increasingly, gaining ascendancy of the patronal hierarchy. The number of small Proconsular African communities producing senatorial patrons in the second and third centuries is large. Naturally, not all similarly sized communities were as successful. Uchi Maius, for example, in close proximity to both Thugga and Bisica Lucana, attests seven patrons of local extraction between the second and late third century, none of whom were senators¹⁰¹. The accession of one of their citizens, the patron M. Attius Cornelianus (B115), to the prestigious position of praetorian prefect under the Gordians was, however, clearly a coup.

In Mauretania Caesariensis and Sitifensis - Tingitana, where no local patrons are attested, is left out of discussion - the ascent of local citizens into the senatorial order is a phenomenon but poorly attested. Only three communities are known to have produced senators, the capitals Caesarea and Sitifis, and Cartenna, where the only known individual was patron of neighbouring Gunugu in the early C3 (C. Fulcinus Fabius Maximus Optatus, B282)¹⁰². Large and moderate sized communities were not numerous, particularly away from the coast, and great distances often separated them. These circumstances favoured the advent of patrons of more modest status; local magistrates, as at Icosium and Auzia under the Severans (B283,284), and local equestrians in Auzia and elsewhere. The latter appear as early as the mid-late C2, for two more important communities, Saldae and Tubusctu (B274 and 276), but at Auzia (B287,296,298,C286), Novar [-] (B287), Satafis (C297) and civitas [N?]epesinor(um) (B295) not until the third century. Necessarily, the influence of the praesides, was nowhere as pervasive as that of their counterpart in Numidia, the

¹⁰¹ All but one of Uchi Maius' seven known patrons date from the mid to the late third century (post 238). The exception is the second century magistrate at Carthage, C. Marius Extricus (B73). Besides the praetorian prefect M. Attius Cornelianus (B115), there are two other equestrians (B153,188), the son of one of the former (B189), and two anonymous persons of unknown status (B154,190). Only one senatorial family, the Pullaieni, are known from the town (or rather its vicinity, the 'praedia Pullaienorum', being at El-Mra Meita, 3 km. north-east of the town, (cf. Uchi 173)).

¹⁰² M. Le Glay, *Tituli V* pp.775-7 notes only two gentes from Sitifis (the Iulii and Coelii), and four from Caesarea (the Annii, Aurelii, Corneli and F[-]ii), besides the Fulcinii of Cartenna/Gunugu. Only Caesarea attests senators in the second century. None are known from Mauretania in the fourth.

legates, and only three communities document them as patrons prior to the fourth century¹⁰³.

The extension of the patronate to local citizens who had not attained the dignity of senatorial rank, is known from only four examples in Numidia prior to the mid-fourth century. One of these, a praefectus pro III viris honoured as patron by the municipes of Sigus, in concert with his own familia of freedmen and slaves, is of uncertain date between the years 98 and 268. No other patrons are known from Sigus, a small pagus in the territory of Cirta. These small pagi probably only ever enjoyed the patronage of the legate indirectly, by virtue of their dependency on Cirta (see pp.65-6). On resort to a selection of the most prominent members of their own community as patrons, few can have been in the position of Caldis and castellum Tidditanorum, whose good fortune it was to have senators in their midst (B213-3a, C243b). Co-optation must, perforce, have devolved upon men of a more modest stamp, as at Sigus.

One of the three remaining patrons, dates to the end of the third century (290-3), and was at once governor of Numidia (v.p., praeses), and a native of Thamugadi, where he is honoured as patron (Aurelius Maximian[us], C258). His combined rôle is identical to that of another patron of Thamugadi seen earlier, the legate Martialianus (C243a), and requires no comment. In the mid-third century, however, two Numidians below senatorial rank were co-opted by communities, hitherto attesting only legates as patrons. One, interestingly, was the son of a Numidian official, the procurator L. Titinius Clodianus, who does not himself appear to have been co-opted. Joint dedications by the ordo to Clodianus, his wife, son and daughters describe only the son as patron (C247 cf. NC 20,102-4). The exclusion of Clodianus as patron is

¹⁰³ gens Mauror(um) Maccuum (MC) (A273), castellum Dianense (MS) (A277), Lemellef (or Thamascani) (MS) (A289). In Tingitana, where another four praesides are known as patron (A272-2a, 285,288,290), the practice of co-opting administrators may have been more frequent, perhaps even regular. The province is in some ways analogous to Numidia. Only four communities of any considerable size are known, Volubilis and Banasa - where the epigraphic record is primarily concentrated - Sala and Tingis, and as the area of the province was relatively small, communication between them was far more expeditious than was possible in Caesariensis. Razzias and more ambitious assaults launched by Berber tribesmen from the security of the Atlas mountains, often meant having to stiffen the forces serving with the praeses. The gratitude of Tingitana's urban population for the security provided by the praeses in such crises is well-known from the famed base erected to Sulpicius Felix at Sala, which praises the praeses' guiding hand behind the exploits of his praefectus (IA48).

not in itself remarkable. There seems to have been a general reluctance to co-opt procurators (other than praesides) in Africa, even when these were local men (see pp.243-4). To the two group (C) patrons known as procurators in Africa (C93,94), may be compared T. Flavius Macer, a native of Calama (NC4) and honoured like Clodianus with a dedication from his patria, but not as patron. Moreover, Cuicul, the same community which erected dedications to Clodianus and his family, also erected a statue to another of its prominent citizens some 80 years earlier, without describing him as patron (NC19). The person in question, L. Alfenus Senecio, was also a procurator, not in Numidia, but of the province of Mauretania Caesariensis, only 10 km. to the west. The dedication to him specifically states that Senecio aided his patria during this administration, yet neither high equestrian office, nor these beneficia availed him in qualifying as patron.

What is odd is that having passed over Clodianus as an acceptable patron, the *ordo* should then confer this dignity upon a son, who holds neither equestrian office nor title, but merely a local priesthood (fl. pp.). It is possible, of course, that the *ordo* anticipated the son's elevation to a career and status equivalent to, or even more prestigious than, that attained by Clodianus. Be that as it may, the co-optation of Clodianus' son was clearly an honour upon the whole family, and Clodianus might accordingly be expected to apply his own energies into ensuring that his son lived up to his obligations as patron. In this regard, we may compare the dedication to the polyonymous patron of Diana, C. Iulius Rufinus (B235), 'ob meri[t]a patris eius', and the prodigious endeavours of Cincius Victor in Thugga, which gained for him both his own co-optation, and that of his son (B45,46)¹⁰⁴.

The second patron of sub-senatorial status co-opted at about this time, P. Iulius Liberalis, patron of Verecunda (B245), displays a career spent entirely outside the imperial service, but the most impressive of its type for the whole of Africa. Besides a

¹⁰⁴ In the case of the father of C. Iulius Rufinus, it is not certain whether the father was patron or not. He has been excluded from the catalogue of *incerti* because his son, as quaestor, was above the age of 25. While the exclusion of fathers of known patrons above the age of 25 has general validity (cf. pp.182-3), the specific nature of the eulogy to Rufinus' father may warrant an exception in this instance.

full municipal cursus in his patria Thamugadi (including the flamine), Liberalis was also flamen in distant Thysdrus, and provincial priest in Africa, a post whose onerous expenses are attested by Augustine¹⁰⁵. Besides being patron at Verecunda, Liberalis is also known to have been honoured by the ordo at Cuicul for unspecified merita, occasioning statues erected both there and at Thamugadi (AE(1914)41). At Thamugadi itself, a fountain donated by him at a cost of over 30,000 sesterces, 'super legi[timam flamonis summam]', survives in situ, with its dedication in bold lettering intact (AE(1979)670). From a recently published epitaph, we also know that Liberalis' illustrious career and numerous beneficia were capped by the admission of both his sons and grandchildren into the amplissimus ordo (AE(1980)955). Clearly then, Liberalis was someone much more than a successful municipal office holder, and there is strong suspicion that he exercised patronage over his patria and Cuicul as well. It is difficult to know whether it was the special calibre and wealth of men like Liberalis and the son of Clodianus (L. Titinius Maximus Clodianus) which occasioned the apparent novelty of extending the patronate to citizens beneath senatorial rank, or whether we may attribute the change to the decline in confidence and security associated with this period. The dedication to Clodianus' son dates to soon after 247, that to Liberalis, to the years 240-68.

Certainly the period between the accession of the emperor Gordian and the demise of Gallienus (238-68) is one particularly impoverished epigraphically in Numidia, as elsewhere in Africa. Besides the fountain of Liberalis, we can point to only one other privately funded construction in the province for the period, and only three building works (other than roadworks) erected under the supervision of administrators¹⁰⁶. No text at all refers to the provision of games, sportulae or gymnasia, while the only reference to the gift of epulae, is that which accompanied the restoration of a temple at

¹⁰⁵ Augustine, ep. 138,19, re Apuleius, 'qui sacerdos provinciae, pro magno fuit ut munera ederet venatoresque vestiret'.

¹⁰⁶ C. Valerius Valentinus restored the temple of Pluto at Macomades in 265, at a cost of 67,500 sesterces (AE(1905)35). Both the administrators who supervised the three public works of this period, were patrons (A246,248). The legate M. Aurelius Cominius Cassianus (signo) Arzygius, between 246-8 saw to the completion of the Capitolium (C2657) and the restoration of the septizonium (C2611, cf. M. Janon, op. cit., pp.222-51), while the curator rei publicae M. Cocceius Anicius Faustus Flavianus oversaw the provision of water to castellum Tidditanorum (ILAlgII3596).

Macomades (see above note). Even minor benefactions (altars, statues, and the like) are attested by very few texts¹⁰⁷. The scarcity of epigraphic documentation suggests that the vitality of municipal life was in recession, as a result of the worsening military situation in the province.

The 15 years between 238 and 253 witnessed the disgrace of the Third Augustan legion, for their part in the massacre of the supporters of the Gordians¹⁰⁸. The years immediately following Gordian's accession saw a contraction of the Severan frontiers, the southernmost defence post castellum Dimmidi being abandoned, and the main line of the limes being strengthened¹⁰⁹. Despite this, and the continuing presence of an effective and largely native cavalry arm, the legion's replacements proved unequal to contain the growing confidence of the Berber tribes¹¹⁰. On the legion's return in 253, numerous captives including bishops (as we know from Cyprian) were in their hands¹¹¹, and over the next seven years, the intensity of the fighting was such as to demand the creation of a unique command, held by M. Cornelius Octavianus 'dux per Africam Numidiam Mauretaniumque'¹¹².

¹⁰⁷ Minor benefactions (1) Verecunda, 253-60 (C4219) - statua Marsyae, 'o[b hono]rem a[e]di[li]ta[tis].' (2) Lambaesis, 260-8 (AE(1904)71) - ara Libero Patri, 'ob apothecam consummatam' (The donor is a primipilaris, cf. C2634 for a statue to Mars erected by another primipilaris at Lambaesis. The date is 253). (3) Cirta, 251-2 (ILAlg II 486) - ara?/statua? (Dedication by the curator rei publicae, and patron of Cirta, M. Cocceius Anicius Faustus Flavianus (see note 106) to 'IOM dis deabusque matri deum magnae Idae e Apollini.' (4) Lambaesis, 246-8 (C2589) - ara to Aesculapius et Hygia. (The donor is the legate M. Aurelius Cominius Cassianus, see note 106). For other dedications by legates at Lambaesis of altars or statues, see AE (1914) 245 and C2615. The dates are 253 and 259. For the dedication of an altar at Gemellae in 255-8, cf. AE (1950)63).

¹⁰⁸ M. Benabou, 'La résistance africaine à la romanisation', Paris, 1975, pp.209-11, believes that the legion was not disbanded purely from motives of revenge, but also to accommodate a new defence strategy. This may be putting the cart before the horse. If Gordian believed the legion's loyalty was unreliable, prudence would dictate that their replacements should withdraw to a more defensible line, both in view of the units without experience of African conditions, and the unsettled military situation, which may be presumed to have preceded the fierce hostilities of the years 253-60.

¹⁰⁹ G. C. Picard, 'Castellum Dimmidi', Alger, 1948 pp.119-23, P. Romanelli, 'Storia delle province romane dell' Africa', Roma, 1959, pp.454-5, M. Benabou, op. cit., p.207.

¹¹⁰ For the Africanisation of such cavalry units as the numerus Palmyrenorum and their continued presence under Gordian, see M. Benabou, op. cit., p.210, P. Romanelli, op. cit., p.461.

¹¹¹ Cyprian 'Lettres', éd. Bayard, coll. Budé II, p.197 (cf. P. Romanelli, op. cit., pp.473-4 and M. Benabou, op. cit., pp.217-8, for whom the 'barbari' may equally well be bandits).

¹¹² For Octavianus see P. Romanelli, op. cit., p.478, M. Benabou, op. cit., pp.220-3, H.G. Pflaum, 'Les Carrières', pp.905-23. He was patron of Bisica Lucana (A119), and perhaps of numerous other communities in the fighting zone (he is attested at not only Bisica Lucana, but Caesarea (AE(1954)136), Sitifis (C8435) and El Mellah, 17 km. south of Sitifis (AE(1942-3)62). For the chronology of the revolts 253-60 and the generals involved in their suppression, see in particular M. Christol, 'Les regnes de Valérien et de Gallien' (253-68) travaux d'ensemble, questions chronologiques', ANRW, II,2, (1975) pp.803-27 and 'Prosopographie de la province de Numidie (253-60)', Ant. Af., X (1976) pp.69-77.

Exceptional times call for exceptional men, and it may be that men of the stamp of Liberalis, Clodianus's son and others, filled a need which the communities' traditional senatorial patrons would not. Besides the likelihood that the number of senatorial victims of Capellianus' massacre in 238 was large, the effectiveness of those senators who survived, in representing their patria, will clearly have suffered from the dislocation of the mid-third century crisis¹¹³. Bonds of amicitia which once opened doors were severed as emperor replaced emperor. Moreover, the emperors themselves, were frequently abroad at the head of an army, and faced with military and economic crises on all sides, obviously less capable of responding to all the requests from the empire's communities. In this situation, communities may be presumed to have looked for a greater input of wealth at home, to offset the economic difficulties, rather than for the benefits of representation abroad. While the province remained on a war footing, troops were clearly less available for the repair and maintenance of buildings and structures of a purely civilian nature, and the purses of Numidia's governors were also less able to accommodate the cost of such undertakings. In this regard, we may note that apart from Lambaesis, castellum Tidditanorum is the only Numidian community known to have benefitted from the involvement of an imperial official in a civilian construction between 238-68, and that the official is not the legate but a curator rei publicae, who in the provisioning of a water supply uses not troops, but a corvée of the local population (ILAlgII 3596; see note 106). The curator, who - contra H. Jouffroy -¹¹⁴ does not appear to have personally contributed financially towards the undertaking, was himself an example of the shifting patterns of co-optation in Numidia, being patron of the Cirtan confederacy, and the only certain group(A) official other than Numidia's governors known as patron¹¹⁵.

¹¹³ For a non-senatorial victim 'pro amore romano quievit ab hoc Capelliano captus', see C2170 from near Theveste.

¹¹⁴ *op. cit.*, p.283. The expression 'ex indulgentia providentiaq. dd. nn.' implies that the finance for the work was imperial (cf. F. Jacques, 'Le privilège de liberté', p.297 and 680 n.70).

¹¹⁵ The uncertainty attaching to group (A) classification for the v.p. rationalis, L. Lucceius Hadrianus (A256) and his wife (A257) has already been noted. Note that neither are senators, and that the date is again late (c260-314).

It is possible, therefore, that in these times of economic hardship the senatorial monopoly of the patronate was broken on the issue of a senatorial reluctance to financially ameliorate the situation when requested. The generous actions of Liberalis, Clodianus and men like them, may have filled the void, setting a precedent for other wealthy and ambitious Numidians to attain the patronate without having first acquired the dignity of senator. We may note, finally, that senators appear nevertheless to have dominated the patronal rolls. The album of Timgad lists six patrons, of whom five are clarissimi (B260-1, A263-5), and the sixth (B262), a sacerdotalis (provinciae Numidiaae)¹¹⁶.

¹¹⁶ The co-optation of another non-senator, however, the curator rei publicae Aelius Iulianus (C266-7) occurred within five years of the album's erection.

Chapter VII Group (C) Patrons and Patronal Families (Groups (B) and (C))

Group (C) comprises 34 individuals, who were either themselves both African officials, and of local (or neighbouring) origo, or who were the wives or children of persons who were. Although sharing characteristics of both group (A) and (B) patrons, they are more properly to be affiliated with the latter, since they can frequently be found to vary from group(A) patrons in two important respects. These are firstly, the duration of the patronate, and secondly, the extension of the patronate to family members.

As has been argued (pp.54 ff.), group (A) patrons ceased to be patrons in anything but name after the expiry of their post in Africa. Dedications erected to members of group (A) outside of the province by client communities in Africa are rare, and none indicate that the recipient had held a new post in the interval between quitting his African office and the dedication's erection. Vulcacius Rufinus (A265), who appears as patron on the album of Timgad in 362-3 (or 365-8) and who is elsewhere (D1237) known to have been governor (Numidia consularis) some 20 years previously, is exceptional amongst group (A) patrons in attesting his patronate beyond the termination of his African duties. In fact, his patria is unknown, and local origo is a strong possibility (see pp.54-6). Five group (C) patrons, on the other hand, are mentioned as patrons some time after their office in Africa had elapsed (see list (A)). For two individuals (C48 and 78), an interval of at least 15 and 20 years respectively has clearly elapsed between tenure of an administrative post in Africa, and the erection of the statue describing them as patron. The former, Q. Caecilius Marcellus Dentilianus, Q.f. Arn. (C48), shows a total of 7 posts posterior to his quaestorship of the province of Africa, whilst the proconsular legate, C. Memmius Fidus Iulius Albius, C. f. Quir. (C78), occupied nine successive posts. A shorter span (probably involving only two or three years at the outside) separates two other proconsular legates (Sex. Caecilius Aemilianus, Sex. filius Quir. (C82 and 82(a), and C. Arrius Calpurnius Longinus, C.f. Quir. (C116)) from their legateship, and the later post (or

posts, in the case of C82(a)) attested for them. In fact, the patronate of both was probably acquired some time before they took up administrative duties in their own province, since two relatives of Caecilius, presumed to be grandfather and father, were patrons in the vicinity, and Arrius' mother - evidently either through her husband or father - was patron of the same community as her son¹. Finally, there is the case of Aelius Iulianus, described as patron on a *tabula patronatus* discovered in the atrium of his villa, and now in the Thamugadi museum. The small plaque describes Iulianus only as *flamen* and *praesidalis* (or honorary praeses of Numidia), omitting reference to the post of *curator rei publicae* held by him twice after the *flaminate*. Iulianus is known to have occupied the curatorship from two other texts (AE (1895) 108 and C2388), datable to 364-7. He is only described as *praesidalis* on the *tabula patronatus*, dated by Chastagnol to the year following his second curatorship, or a little later². The conferment of patronage appears to have been rather the result of Iulianus' acquisition of the status of *honoratus*, than of his having held the curatorship. The curatorship was, from the time of Constantine, an office much reduced in prestige and authority, being little more than a municipal *munus*, albeit one normally involving considerable personal expense³. Iulianus is, therefore, perhaps more properly to be viewed as a group (B) patron, than a member of group (C), but even though the administrative post he occupied was minor, appears to have antedated his actual co-optation, and is not even mentioned on the *tabula patronatus*, a causal link between the post and his co-optation may be referred to in the phrase '*ob reparationem civitatis*', the motivation given by the *ordo* for electing Iulianus as patron. The phrase is apparently a reference to his supervision of a major building project during the term of his second curatorship. The project involved repairs to the four sides of the portico surrounding the Capitolium, and it may well be that extensive

¹ The procurator Sex. Caecilius Crescens Volusianus, Q.f. Quir., patron of a municipium near Thuburbo Minus (B56), and the consularis Sex. Caecilius Volusianus patron of Thuburbo Minus (B99), are generally regarded as being avus and pater of Aemilianus (cf. Tituli V p.735). Arrius' mother Oscia Modesta [-]ia[-] Cornelia Patruina Publina (B113) was wife of C. Arrius Calpurnius Frontinus Honoratus, consul (IB77). Her father is not known.

² A. Chastagnol, '*L'album municipal de Timgad*', Bonn, 1978, pp.47-8.

³ C. Lucas, '*Notes on the curatores rei publicae of Roman Africa*', JRS, 30 (1940), pp.56 ff..

personal funds were injected into the construction. However, additional generosity connected with his advancement to *honoratus* may also be included in the unspecified 'reparatio'⁴.

It has been observed earlier (pp.52-3), that with one exception, the extension of the patronate to the wives and children of group (A) patrons is unknown in Africa, other than where sons accompanied their father in the capacity of proconsular legates⁵. The exception, Fabia V[ic]t[or]ia Iovina wife of a v.p., *rationalis* (A257), appears by her nomenclature to be African, and she may have been connected to local Fabii at Cirta (see p.54) and thus not a representative of group (A) at all. As might be expected, the situation alters entirely when the wives and children of officials in Africa of local (or neighbouring *origo*) are considered. In all, the wives and children of seven such officials are known. In two instances (a proconsul, father of C63, and a procurator, father of C247), patronate is not so far attested for the official himself, but for the former at least can be presumed to have existed⁶. The two wives (C106 and 150), three of the four sons (C63,244,286), and three daughters (C79, 151 and 152) co-opted, were apparently co-opted simultaneously with their husband or father. This is evidently so for L. Accius Iulianus Asclepianus, the consular curator of Utika, where a dedication by the *ordo* is made conjointly to Accius, his wife and his two daughters (C149,150,151,152) as *patroni perpetui*. As his daughters were still young girls (*clarissimae puellae*), we can be sure that their co-optation did not long precede the dedication to them by the *ordo*. Similarly, the son of the legate P. Iulius Iunianus Martialianus (signo) Leontius (C243), is described as *patronus* on an (unpublished) statue base erected in his *patria* Thamugadi by the *ordo*, whilst still *c(larissimus) p(uer)* (P. Iul(ius)) Iunianus Tironillianus (signo) Leontius (C244)). Q. Gargilius Martialis,

⁴ The payment of an *inlatio auri* by *honorati* on the occasion of their promotion is known from the Theodosian Codex (VI 22.2) in a lex of 338 transmitted to Thamugadi (cf. A. Chastagnol, *op. cit.*, p.48 n.29). For the probability that 'reparatio' embraced not only the public constructions known under his curatorship, but other private benefactions, including those associated with his advancement to *honoratus* ('reparatio' being taken in its broadest sense), see *ibid.*, p.48 and C. Lepelley, 'Les cités', II p.453 and n.41.

⁵ Outside of Africa, no examples exist at all.

⁶ A dedication by the *ordo* to the father of C247, the procurator, L. Titinius Clodianus, *e.v.*, allows for no possibility that the brief *lacunae* may have mentioned his patronate.

Q. f. Quir. (C286), son of a homonymous curator and patron of Auzia in Mauretania, and himself patron of his patria, was clearly still a youth at the time the text was inscribed, since he describes himself as *militiae petitor* (C286). A later inscription (C9047) shows that Martialis completed his *tres militiae*, and attained the prestigious title of *pat(ronus) prov(inciae Mauretaniae Caesariensis)* before being cut off in his prime in an ambush, soon after a glorious victory over a rebel chieftain, Faraxen. Martialis may also have been co-opted as patron by Auzia whilst puer, as the text relating his patronate is not a dedication by the *ordo*, but a statue base erected by Martialis to his parents, apparently in *memoriam* after their death. His mother, Iulia Prima, is not incidentally, described as also having been patron, and we may presume that she wasn't, the context being one particularly appropriate for mention of her rank and titles.

PATRONAE OF GROUPS (B) AND (C)

Iulia Prima's exclusion warrants no surprise. While more patronae are known from Africa than from the rest of the empire combined, their numbers are still low (13), and with one exception - Fabia V[ic]t[or]ia Iovina (A257), the wife of a v.p. *rationalis* (see above) - are all of senatorial status⁷. The 12 *clarissimae* patronae from Africa - seven from group (B), and five from group (C) - form a very small fraction of the total of known patrons from both groups (12/171 or 7.02% . Even when consideration is restricted to senators, they attain only 1/7 (or a little over) of the total (12/81 or 14.81%)⁸.

⁷ Only seven patronae occur outside of Africa, all from Italy.

- (1) Capertia Valeriana, Maximi f. (AE(1976)250),
- (2) Helvidia Burrenia Modesta (signa) Laeucadii, Mel. fil. (C11.4180)
- (3) Abeinia Balbina, C.f. (C11.6354)
- (4) Domitia Melpis (C11.3368)
- (5) Laberia Marcia Hostilia Crispina, M.f. (AE (1964) 106)
- (6) Nummia Varia (C9.3429)
- (7) Aurelia Crescentia (C9.4894)

(cf. C. Goudineau, 'Note sur Antistia Pia Quintilla, flaminique et patronne', *Gallia*, XXXVII (1979) pp.271-3, who correctly dismisses the purported patrona of colonia Flavia Tricastinorum, Gallia Narbonensis, AE (1962) 143).

Four are *clarissimae feminae* (n.2,4,5,6), one the wife of a procurator (n.7), one a *flaminica* (n.3), and the last, a person of unknown status (n.1). Patronae in Africa occur at C79, B102 (=240), C106, B107,108,110,113,137,146, C150,151,152,A257.

⁸ Group (B) patronae - B102(=240),107,108,110,113,137,146.

The higher proportion of females amongst group (C) patrons is probably rather due to the fact that three of the five known emanate from one text (C150,151, and 152, the wife and daughters of the consular curator from Utika), than to any genuine reflection of significant advantages deriving from the African office of their husband or father⁹. All patronae from group (C) were necessarily either wives (C106, 150) or daughters (C79,151,152) of patrons. Fabia V[ic]t[or]ia Iovina (A257) is likewise the wife of a patron. Attributed with a query to group (A), she ought more properly to be assigned to group (B) or (C), depending on whether her husband's post of *rationalis* was held in Numidia or abroad (see p.54). There is a very strong presumption that the patronate of group (B) patronae similarly derived from - *an*^d in most cases probably coincided with - the patronate conferred on husband or father. Epigraphic evidence for such an assumption does not exist, the nearest relation of any group (B) patrona also known to have held the patronate being C. Arrius Calpurnius Longinus, C.f. Quir. (C114), son of Oscia Modesta [-]ia[-]ia Cornelia Patruina Publina (B113). Both were patrons of Avioccala. Notwithstanding the failure of the epigraphic evidence to explicitly state from whom the patronate for group (B) patronae ultimately derived, this can be ascertained with some degree of confidence from prosopography, and from internal evidence of the texts, on which the patronae are mentioned. Analysis at this juncture is provided to illustrate the point that group (B) patronae were seldom, if ever, co-opted in isolation, and that on this point, as on others (e.g. senatorial status and the extension of the patronate to *puellae* as well as *feminae*), they are virtually indistinguishable from their peers in group (C). The only exception appears to lie with the first of two quite exceptional patronae - Iulia Avita Mamaea Augusta (B108), mother of the reigning emperor (Severus Alexander), and patron of Lepcis Magna. The other - also imperially connected - is Vibia Aurelia Sabina (B102

Group (C) patronae - C79,106,150,151,152.

⁹ The seven group (B) patronae are 5.07% of all group (B) patrons (138 in all), and 11.86% of all senators from this group (59 in all).

The five group (C) patronae are 14.71% of all group (C) patrons (34 in all) and 21.74% of all senators from this group (23 in all).

and 240), 'aunt' of the reigning emperor (Caracalla), and 'sister' and daughter of two previous emperors (Severus and Marcus)¹⁰.

Neither patronae were themselves African, but are attributed to group (B) because of close associations formed with their African clients by family members. Mamaea, for example, although herself from Emesa in Syria, was cousin of Caracalla, a Lepcitane. In the uncertain climate of the third century, her son was eager to emphasise links with a previous dynasty, and it served the purposes of the Lepcitanes equally well to affirm the historic ties that linked their city with the family. Possibly Mamaea owned family estates in Lepcis Magna, but if so, this would be an incidental factor to her suitability as patron. Neither her father, the consul Iulius Avitus, nor her husband, the procurator Gessius Marcianus - both Syrians - are known to have held any African posts¹¹, and one may doubt whether Lepcis Magna had any other claim on either for bestowing the patronate. Mamaea's father was dead when Alexander's reign began and her husband disappears from view in all accounts of the reign. To have Mamaea as patron was akin to having the emperor himself as patron, since Mamaea was universally recognised as the power behind the throne.¹² With the resumption of the Severan dynasty after the transient reign of Macrinus, the female and Eastern branch of the family - first Mamaea's sister Soaemias, mother of Elagabalus, and then Mamaea herself - exerted dominance. Belated recognition of the Syrian sisters by Lepcis Magna may have taken the unusual form of bestowing the patronate, as a dramatic reminder that their city had a special claim to imperial affection¹³. This

¹⁰ In her title - *divi M.f. divi Severi sor.* - Vibia maintains the fiction of the Severan dynasty that Septimius Severus was adopted by her father Marcus Aurelius.

¹¹ Uncertainty attaches to three posts (*proconsul Asiae*, *legatus Mesopotamiae*, and *sunedros in Cyprus*) attributed to Iulius Avitus by Dio Cassius. He was evidently consul under Severus (PIR, I190). Gessius Marcianus (PIR, G171) is said to have held several procuratorships, but none are specified. African administration by one or both cannot be ruled out. This is not the case for the husband of Mamaea's sister Soaemias, Sex. Varius Marcellus, whose cursus (C10.6569 cf. H.G. Pflaum, 'Carrières', n.237) includes a governorship in Numidia, but nothing in Africa *Proconsularis*.

¹² Cf. Herodian V8,10,VI9,1

Eutropius, XXIII

Dio Cassius, fragment, Loeb vol. IX p.489.

S.H.A., Severus Alexander, XIV, 7, LX, 2.

¹³ The patronate of Soaemias may be deduced from that of Mamaea's. Her situation was analogous, even though her son appears to have often been deaf to parental advice. No reference to her son's reign survives from Lepcis Magna, but then *damnatio memoriae* ensured that little testimonial remains from Africa as a whole (cf. PIR,I704, V184 and recently, AE(1985)976). Soaemias' (hypothetical) patronate presumably

affection, despite the restoration of the dynasty, now seemed set to be transposed to Emesa. Lepcis Magna could hope neither to compete with the bonds of a patria, nor to expect largesse and privileges on anything resembling the scale of that bestowed by Severus and Caracalla¹⁴. Soaemias and Mamaea, as only distant kin (cousins) of the latter, seem unlikely to have been accorded anything more than passing recognition by Lepcis Magna prior to the accession of their own children. No connection with the city is known for their father or husbands, and they themselves may only ever have set foot in Africa - if at all - as part of the imperial entourage during Severus' visit in 203. The connection with the two sisters may have been faint, but properly exploited, it offered Lepcis Magna a good opportunity to re-establish something of her former position after the unpleasant hiatus of Macrinus¹⁵. The Augustae themselves facilitated the claims of the Lepcitanes for special attention, by maintaining the fiction that their sons were the sons of Caracalla - they were in fact his nephews. Lepcis Magna could equally avail herself of the fiction, to portray herself publicly as patria of the young emperor's 'father'. Mamaea's acceptance of the patronate from the Lepcitanes suggests that she was alert to every opportunity, which enabled Alexander to pose as Caracalla's son. How Mamaea responded to her patronal obligations is unknown - there are no public buildings, for example, which can be ascribed to Alexander's reign. Indubitably, some mark of imperial favour resulted from Mamaea's co-optation, but if the accusation of niggardliness impugned by the sources is accurate, it is unlikely to have exceeded the Lepcitanes' expectations.¹⁶

predated Mamaea's. The latter is unlikely to have been co-opted until her son's accession as Caesar (221) at the earliest, given the fierce rivalry between the two sisters.

¹⁴ Severan generosity was on a truly imperial scale, and included a forum and basilica complex, an imposing quadrifrontal arch, a monumental colonnaded street, an artificial harbour, a nymphaeum and the so-called 'hunting baths'. See J. B. Ward-Perkins, 'Severan Art and Architecture at Lepcis Magna' *JRS*, 38 (1948) pp.59-80, 'The Art of the Severan Age in the Light of Tripolitanian Discoveries', *PBA*, 37(1951) pp.268-92, 'Excavations in the Severan Basilica at Lepcis Magna, 1951' *PBSR*, 20 (1952), pp.111-21, and compare P. MacKendrick, 'The North African Stones Speak', London (1980) pp.159-63. Severus granted Lepcis Magna the *ius italicum* (Dig. L, 15, 8, 11), possibly in 202 (IRT 393, 423, cf. 441 and p.81), from which date the Lepcitani appear to have described themselves as *Septimiani* (IRT p.81).

¹⁵ No inscriptions - understandably - survive at Lepcis from Macrinus' brief reign. Shortage of sympathy between the two is likely to have been mutual, and the Lepcitanes may be presumed to have wasted little time destroying whatever embarrassing evidence existed as a reminder of the rule.

¹⁶ Cf. Herodian VI, 1, 8, and S.H.A. Severus Alexander XIV, 6, for Mamaea's parsimony.

Mamaea's patronate, which evidently owed nothing to her father or husband, but everything to the unique circumstances by which she found herself as de facto ruler of the Roman empire, must be treated as an exception. By contrast, the co-optation of Vibia Aurelia Sabina is inextricably linked to her marriage with the African L. Antistius Burrus, and may thus be compared to the co-optation of other African patronae, whose husbands or fathers were prominent African senators. Vibia was patron of two African communities, Thibilis, her husband's patria (B240), and Calama, 18 km. to the south-west, where Burrus presumably also owned property (B102). Thibilis, which with evident pride describes herself as Vibia's patria - the interpretation is rather free - was apparently her principal residence¹⁷. Burrus' father,¹⁸ the consul Q. Antistius Adventus Postumius Aquilinus, rose to prominence under Marcus. His numerous offices included command of legions in the campaigns of Verus in Parthia (for which he was decorated), and in those of Marcus in Germany. The choice of Burrus as Vibia's spouse was probably Marcus', and it may have been in anticipation of the betrothal that the Antistii were adlected 'inter gentes patricios' sometime prior to 178¹⁹. The marriage itself cannot have taken place until after Burrus' consulship early in Commodus' reign (181)²⁰. Cleander's machinations ensured that the union was brief - at the most 7 years.²¹

¹⁷ See above (p.108) for the Antistian villa at Thibilis. The estates there evidently extended as far as Ras-el-Aioun near Bordj Sabath (AE (1972) 697-8). Other holdings may have been at Cirta (cf. IL AlgII613).

¹⁸ See, however, F. Bertrandy, 'Une grande famille de la confédération Cirtéenne: les Antistii de Thibilis', *Cah. de. Tun.*, XXIV (1976) pp.11-12, where Burrus is identified with Adventus' brother, L. Antistius Mundicius Burrus.

¹⁹ cf. *ibid.*, p.13.

²⁰ H. G. Pflaum 'Les gendres de Marc. Aurèle', *Journal des Savants* (1961) (1961) 38-9, and F. Bertrandy, *op. cit.*, p.13, prefer a date of about 178. There are no grounds, however, for discounting the evidence of Philostratus *vitae soph.* II, I, 11 which would put the date of her birth at about 170 (cf. A. R. Birley, 'Marcus Aurelius', London, 1966, p.222). The earliest conceivable date of her marriage would therefore be in 182, the year after Burrus' consulship. A date of 184-185, when Vibia was in her fourteenth or fifteenth year, would suit best. See now R. Syme, 'The age at marriage of Roman senators', *Historia* (1987) p.318 - 14-15 was an optimum age for senatorial girls to marry, although earlier instances at the age of 12 or 13 are known. A recently published dedication to a daughter of Marcus from Belalis Maior in Africa Proconsularis (AE(1978)841, cf. A. Mahjoubi, 'Recherches d'histoire et d'archéologie à Henchir-el-Faouar, la cité des Belalitani Maiores', Tunis, 1978, pp. 158-60) may refer to Vibia. The text is dated by the editors to 166, by analogy with dedications here to Marcus' son M. Annius Verus at this date, and to Marcus' daughter Lucilla at the same date, or soon after (166-9) (AE (1978, 839-40). The cognomen of the recipient of the text is unfortunately missing in its entirety, and may equally as well have referred to Vibia's elder sister Fadilla. If the text is to Vibia, and was erected conjointly with other statues to her family, the date of Vibia's marriage to Burrus may have preceded 182. Belalis Maior was, however, clearly indebted to Marcus for some *immunitas* or civic promotion (cf. A. Mahjoubi, *loc. cit.*), and is unlikely to have stinted at erecting a statue to a daughter born later than the particular occasion on which the rest of Marcus' family was

The interval may have been used by the communities of Thibilis and Calama to co-opt Vibia - her teenage years being more than outweighed by her imperial birth, and her marriage into the family of their most eminent citizen. Both communities were small, and the occasion must have been a moment of enormous pride to them. Recognition of the prestigious event must inevitably have been accompanied by the erection of statues to the couple in a prominent site, and the sending of a delegation to deliver congratulatory speeches. Included in the envoy's address may well have been an invitation to Vibia to accept the communities in her patronage. The dominant position of the Antistii in their patria and beyond makes it virtually certain that the patronate had already been extended to Burrus and his father. For Burrus, no epigraphic material exists at all - outside of references (for dating purposes) to his consulship - either in Africa or elsewhere. Other inscriptions bearing his name may have suffered destruction as a reaction to his downfall - at least in his patria²². The situation is entirely different for his father Adventus, whose name is commemorated by 7 Numidian texts (six from Thibilis - ILAlgII 4631,4634,4651,4655,4681,4682 and another from Cirta - ILAlgII613).²³ The burden of office left Adventus little opportunity for otium, but he is known to have returned from abroad on at least one occasion (AD170-4), a dedication being erected to him at Thibilis by a private client (ILAlgII 4681).²⁴ To the same period - the longest hiatus in Adventus' career - probably belong fragmentary dedications to him at Thibilis and Cirta (ILAlgII4682 and 613). Erected by persons unknown - but presumably by the local ordo or a private

honoured. The text reads: 'Aureliae [-] imp. Caes. M. Au[relii] Antonini Aug. Armeniaci [Par]thici Med[ici] fili]ae, d.d.p.p.'.

²¹ For Burrus' death at the instigation of Cleander, see S.H.A. vita Comm. 6.11. A later date of 189-90 has recently been preferred by M. Corbier (Tituli V p.77).

²² cf. the acephalous dedication to C. Arrius Antoninus (an alleged conspirator, possibly co-conspirator of Burrus - cf. Tituli V, p.763 and 770) at Cirta. Was the destruction of the top of the stone deliberate?

²³ cf. dedications by Adventus' freedman Agathopus at Ras-el-Aioun near Thibilis AE(1972)697 and 698, the former 'pro salve Antistio[r(um)]'. Some five or six texts attest Adventus' presence abroad (cf. PIR, A754 tituli 9,10,11,12,14 and perhaps Mél. d'arch. 27,499).

²⁴ cf. dedications by Adventus' freedman Agathopus for Adventus' welfare, ILAlgII4631,4634,4651,4655 (cf. AE (1972)697), particularly ILAlgII 4631 dedicated to Fortuna Redux, of unknown date, but perhaps contemporary to ILAlgII4634, when Adventus was legatus leg.II Adiutricis (in 164). Adventus evidently intended to return to his patria, and may have done so prior to 170-4.

client - the texts may have added the detail of his patronate at the end of his cursus²⁵. If so, the dedications were probably prompted by Adventus' return, or by some benefaction concomitant upon it, rather than intended as a recognition of his new position as patron. The response of Fronto to the Cirtan ordo a decade earlier indicates that eminent senators residing or serving abroad were targeted as potential patroni, and that this might occur at a relatively early stage in their career²⁶. Burrus' patronate, by analogy with other clarissimi pueri, clarissimi iuvenes, and patroni a parentibus recorded as patrons in Africa, is likely to have flowed on from that presumed for his father.

The assignation of Vibia's co-optation to a date soon after her marriage with Burrus (182-9) need not be disproved by the much later date at which her patronage is actually attested. In fact, the statue bases from Thibilis and Calama describing Vibia as patron both postdate the reign of Severus (211-12 and post 211 (211-17?) respectively); a minimum of 22 years thus having elapsed between their erection and the formalisation of her marriage with Burrus. The conjunction of two dedications to Vibia as patron by two neighbouring communities, at approximately the same time, probably betokens a similar motivation. In Thibilis, the statue to her is specifically stated to have been occasioned 'ob singu[l]arem eius in patr[ia]m adfectionem'. No such motive lies to hand for the statue erected to her at Calama, but the reticence of local senates to define, or even mention, the liberalities of patrons (and other benefactors) is well known. It is probable then, that both communities experienced some specific munificence from Vibia. The event to which this generosity was linked was almost certainly a recent decision on her part to retire to her African estates (see appendix). Her adventus would have been a major event in Thibilis and Calama, the more so as it was preceded

²⁵ Mention of his patronate of Thibilis or Cirta would, however, be far less likely if the dedication were by a private client. That erected to him by the client Sex. Marcius Maximus in Thibilis, for example, omits reference to Adventus' (presumed) patronate (ILAlgII 4681). Only two inscriptions from Numidia put up by private clients, add the detail of their patron's municipal patronate (B219 and 232, both from Cirta, the latter to the contemporary C. Arrius Antoninus, q.v., n. 22 above). By comparison, 11 texts erected by private clients in Numidia, whose recipients are elsewhere known to have been patrons of the community in which the text was erected, omit this detail ('Personal Patrocinia' n.6, 12-19, 56, 119 cf. 120-121).

²⁶ Fronto, *Ad Amicos* II, 11. Fronto was consul by the time a request by the Cirtans that he become their patron was turned down, but this may not have been their first attempt. Fronto was, for example, patron of Calama (where the Antistii also owned praedia) whilst only praetor (B47).

by what appears to have been a long absence abroad, and it may, indeed, have been Vibia's first opportunity to set foot in Numidia and view her estates. Beneficence befitting her rank must have marked an occasion so important, and the dedications at Thibilis and Calama may be dated sufficiently closely to the first attestation of Vibia in Africa (ILAlgI 242 in Calama, probably of late Severan dating) for them to be plausibly viewed as testimony to such beneficence. The completion of an imposing construction would account for a delay of a few years, for example, between her arrival and the dedication of statues to her.

During the 20 years or more between Vibia's marriage into the Antistii and the day on which she first permanently resided on her Numidian estates, close communication between herself and the estates' bailiffs evidently ensued, and consequent involvement in the affairs of the neighbouring communities of Thibilis and Calama was inevitable. The duration of such contact suggests that the relationship between Vibia and these communities would become formalised as one between patron and client sooner rather than later, and if sooner, before the death of Burrus, and presumably in the first flush of exuberance at their link with the imperial house. Deferment of Vibia's co-optation to the moment when she first actually resided in Numidia cannot be entirely discounted. To credit such a belated offering, however, is to belie both the importance of the initial bond forged with the communities by virtue of her marriage, and the evident maintenance of close, continuous and good relations between herself and them, culminating in her permanent retirement there, when opportunity finally allowed.

It has been seen that the patronate was rarely extended to females outside of the senatorial order in Africa, and that the female/male ratio even amongst this group was very low (about 1/7 of all senatorial patrons in groups B and C). Notwithstanding the fact that the feminine component of known African senators presents an almost identical imbalance (c62/353 or a little over 1/6²⁷, the under-representation of women

²⁷ The figures - based on M. Corbier and M. LeGlay, *Tituli V* (1982) pp.685-781 - do not represent all known African senators. The list of M. Corbier does not go beyond the third century, and both lists contain minor omissions.

as patrons by a margin of about 1/7 probably reflects the reality of the situation. The failure of so many African *clarissimae* to materialise in our sources (almost all of which are epigraphic) is testimony to the constraints placed upon them in almost every endeavour of provincial life. Excluded from public office by their gender, the primary permissible avenues for their involvement in public affairs were as priestesses, benefactors, or patrons of communities or societies²⁸. The local priesthoods were almost universally rejected as being beneath their station, and only four senatorial women can be identified unequivocally as donors (or part-donors) of buildings in Africa.²⁹ Two of these were patrons; [Iul]ia Me[m]mia [Pris?]ca Ru[-] Aemi[liana] Fidia[na] (C79), whose monumental baths in Bulla Regia still dominate the site, and Seia Potitia Consortiana (B137), awarded a statue at Thibaris 'ob insignem eius et innumerabile(m) liberalitatem qua ordine(m) et patriam donatione sua amplificavit'. The dedication, erected on her demise - she is *c(larissimae) m(emoriae) f(emina)* - evidently refers to large-scale building works. A similar phrase applied to Oscia Modes[ta-]ia[-]ia Cornelia [P]a[t]ruina Publana (B113) - 'ob insign(na) eius merita quibus inlustrat originis suae patriam' - may indicate munificence of a similar type and scale, and it has already been suggested that the 'adfectio' for which Vibia Aurelia Sabina is praised in Thibilis may have included building works funded by her. It is not possible to say with certainty for any recorded instance of benefaction by a patrona, whether this benefaction preceded (and precipitated?) co-optation, resulted from the co-optation itself, or was the product of some later (and perhaps unconnected) desire to benefit the community. On the other hand, as women were restricted to a far greater degree than men in the manner in which they could intervene on their community's behalf, munificence - particularly in the form of building

²⁸ By 'involvement in public affairs', I am not here concerned with their interaction with the community (and of necessity, from time to time, with the curia) either in their capacity as *domina praediorum*, or through their commercial activities. Their rôle as litigants is likewise not under consideration.

²⁹ None of Africa's 65 *flaminicae*, for example, attest a *clarissima femina*. For the two donors who were patrons, see C79 and B137. The two who remain were part-donors, Clodia Macrina who completed a temple to Apollo promised by her grandfather at Muzuc (C12058), and an anonymous *c(larissima) f(emina)* from Thabborra, who jointly contributed towards a construction of unknown type (ILA221). Note also two *clarissimae feminae* praised 'ob...liberalitatem' at Uchi Maius (C26273) and Vaga (C1223), and a third, donor of a costly benefaction, a bronze altar at Bulla Regia (ILA449=AE(1916)77).

donations - may have been more commonly associated with - and anticipated from - senatorial patronae than their male counterparts. This view finds some support from the figures for the building benefactions of local senators. The total of all such benefactions is, however, strikingly low (20)³⁰, when the financial assets of senators are remembered. Fifteen of the constructions were provided by males, four by women, and one through a joint donation involving at least one woman³¹. The

³⁰ See references in note below.

³¹ Donations of buildings by local senators

(A) male

- (1) Caelius Severus (signo) Thoracius (Pupput, AD282, C24095) - restoration of forum, 'cum aedibus e[st] Capi]tolio et curia.'
- (2) L. Octavius Aur[elianus?] Didasius (Ureu, end C3-C4, AE(1975) 880) - restoration of baths.
- (3) [-Ani]cius Faustinus (Karthago, C3-C4, C24584a) - unknown edifice given or restored (origo Uzappa?).
- (4) [-Ter]tullus (Hr. Sliman, C3-C4, C939) - restoration of temple.
- (5) L. Aemilius Frontinus, L.f. Quir. (Oea, AD183-5, IRT230) - gift of temple of Genius coloniae (in addition to HS 1 million as a foundation for sportulae).
- (6) L. Messius Rufinus, L.f. (Sabratha, AD 186-92, IRT29) - portico of temple of Hercules given or restored.
- (7) anon. (Madauros, c350-92, ILA12117) - gift of portico.
- (8) Cl[audius] Gallus (Lambaesis, AD203, AE (1957) 123) - completion of temple to Deae Caelestis (origo Rusicade?).
- (9) Ti. Cl[audius] Subatianus Proculus (Cuicul, AD210, AE (1917-18) 27) - restoration of temple.
- (10) Rutilius Saturninus (Cuicul) AD 364-7, C20156 and AD 367-72, C8234 gift of basilica vestiaria and second basilica.
- (11) M. Iulius Quintianus Flavius Rogatianus (Thamugadi, C3, D9362) - gift of opus bibliothecae.
- (12) [-]lius Festus (Sufetula, 364-7, C234 = AE (1958)158 - gift of fountain.
- (13) Q. Pompeius Balbus (Blaed Djedida, late C2-C3, C954) - completion of building commenced by his grandmother.
- (14) Marcus Tertullus (Bulla Regia, 196-7, C25515) - temple of Diana Corollicita bequeathed in will.
- (15) M. Valerius Quadratus (Althiburos, C3, C27772) - temple of Ceres? or Venus? donated.

(B) female

- (16) [Iul]ia Me[m]mia [Pris?]ca Ru[-]Aemi[liana] Fidia[na] (Bulla Regia, 193-211, ILA454a) - gift of baths.
- (17) Seia Potitia Consortiana (Thibaris, C3, ILA511) - unspecified building works given or restored.
- (18) Clodia Macrina (Muzuc, C3, C12058) - completion of temple of Apollo promised by her grandfather.
- (19) Aquilia Blaesilla (Lepcis Magna, mid-late C2, ined. cf. Tituli IV, p.462) - gift of 'la Schola du Decumanus'.

(C) male and female

- (20) anonymous with three anonymous clarissimi pueri and an anonymous clarissima femina (Thabborra, C3, ILA221) - unknown edifice given or restored.

Possible additions are -

- (1) anonymous, v.c.? (Agbia, late C3-C4, C15557) - unknown edifice given or restored.
- (2) Publius Caecionius Caecina Albinus (Cuicul, AD 364-7?, AE (1913)23) - basilica? given or restored (cf. J. Matthews, 'Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court AD 364-425', Oxford (1975), p.28 n.7, reading, 'dispositam a pat[re suo basilicam-] dedicavit', and not 'dispositam a pat[ribus - restauravit?] dedicavit.' The dedicand was the son of Caecionius, Caecina Decius Albinus, consularis of Numidia 383-92. Compare also AE(1913)35, apparently referring to the same benefaction.
- (3) [-]nus Iulius Patruinus and Basil(ia) P[-] (Djebel Mansour, post 268, AE(1977)856) possible donors of a temple. The fragmentary text, on a lintel over 200 cm. long, reads '[-]vivim religiose coniuncti amore pat[riae-]'.
N.B. cf. n.98 p.150 for 3 senatorial benefactors of buildings in Africa of non-local origin.

female/male ratio is thus over 1/5, a marked improvement upon the female/male ratio of senatorial patrons from groups B and C (1/7). Restricting our observations to the donors who were patrons (6), the ratio of females responsible for building benefactions almost doubles (2/6)³². Statistically, at least, *clarissimae patronae* of groups (B) & (C) outshone their male counterparts as contributors of major civic constructions, by over 3-1 (2/12 or 16.66% cf. 4/69 or 5.8%).

The prevalence of senatorial *patronae* over *patroni* as building benefactors may even exceed this ratio - the likelihood that two others (*Oscia Modesta* and *Vibia Aurelia Sabina*) were building benefactors has already been discussed, and another two, *Calpurnia Ceia Aemiliana* (C106 and 106a) and *Furcilia Optata T[iberia?]na* (B110) are known only from unpublished texts.

The imbalance of 1/7 for female/male senatorial patrons, suggests that a similar ratio applies to the number of *patronae* drawn from the total of *clarissimae*. If so, some process of more rigid selectivity was in place, and from the evidence presented above, a determining factor may have been the munificence - undertaken or prospective - of certain *clarissimae*. The low overall yield of senatorial building benefactions - male or female - indicates that a large number might be excluded on these grounds, whilst four out of ten senatorial *patronae* documented by published inscriptions exhibit munificence of some kind, all conceivably on a grand scale (C79, B113, 137, 240).

If munificence was a criterion in the co-optation of *clarissimae feminae*, it can hardly have been applied in the case of the three attested *clarissimae puellae* co-opted at *Utika* (C151 and 152) and *Bulla Regia* (B146). Even as a partial explanation as to why some *clarissimae* were co-opted, and others not, caution needs to be sounded. The case of *Memmia*, donor of the baths at *Bulla Regia* (C79), is of particular significance in this regard. *Memmia* and her father, *C. Memmius Fidus Iulius Albius*, C.f. *Quir.* (C78), are attested as patrons of *Bulla Regia* by only one text (ILA454a), a fragmentary statue base evidently erected to *Memmia* to celebrate the completion of her

³² *Patronae*: C79 and B137 (= 16 and 17 above).
Patroni: C123, B192, B202 and B90 (= 1, 2, 7 and 14 above).

baths. Her father, however, was almost certainly patron at least 20 years earlier in 175-7, whilst legate of the proconsul of Africa, if not before³³. The analogy with [Aradia] Ros[cia-]ne [-]e(?)[-] Calpurnia Purgilla, P.f. (B146), a compatriot, collateral and near-contemporary, co-opted as patron whilst only a girl, and whilst her father had attained no particular distinction (he was as yet a c(larissimus) i(uvenis)), renders insecure any direct connection between Memmia's co-optation and her provision of costly baths.

The co-optation of clarissimae puellae was clearly principally designed to flatter the child's father, although an eye to their eventual marriage into an important family may have played a part in the calculations of the ordo (No male siblings for instance, are known for any of the puellae co-opted.). It may, therefore, be the case that selection of patronae was prompted not so much by the proclivity of some clarissimae to promote themselves publicly through munificence, as by the importance which the ordo attached to certain senatorial families of exceptional lustre. Such a family was certainly the Aradii, of Bulla Regia and the locale. Together with their collaterals the Memmii and Roscii, they are known to have produced seven patrons in the area, five of them patronae³⁴. Four of the patrons comprise a former legate of the proconsul of Africa and his daughter (the Memmii, C78 and 79), and an acting proconsul of Africa and his wife (Q. Aradius Rufinus Optatus Aelianus, agens vice p[r]ocos. Afrik., C105A, and Calpurnia Ceia Aemiliana, C106 and 106a). The patronate of male connections of the three remaining patronae is virtually beyond contention for the father of the clarissima puella [Aradia] Ros[cia-]ne[-]e(?)[-] Calpurnia Purgilla (B146) (L. Aradius Roscius Rufinus Saturninus Tiberianus, c.i.), and highly probable for the husbands of the other two. Meaningful comment on the family of Furcilia Optata T[iberia?]na (B110) must be waived until publication of the texts concerning herself, her husband (P.) Aradius Paternus, her son [P.Ara]dius Pa[ter]nus Rufi[nia]nus

³³ L. Harmand, 'Le patronat', p.206 n.79.

³⁴ Patroni - C78, 105A.

Patronae - C79, 106-106a, B110, 137, 146

cf. also Q. Aradius Valerius Rufinus Proculus (signo) Populonium, praeses Byzacenae and patron of six communities in the province (A164-164e).

Aelia[nus Iu?]n., c.p., and her father Furcilius Cen[sor ? Au?]gur³⁵. It may be surmised, however, from the description of Furcilia's father by M. Corbier as 'un notable de Bulla'³⁶ that her patronate did not derive from him, but attended her marriage into the Aradii. Seia Potitia Consortiana (B137), patron of nearby Thibaris, is also unlikely to have derived her patronate from her father, who is himself unknown, and whose origins cannot be chartered. The source is again probably attributable to her husband - anonymous, but closely linked to the Aradii and Memmii to judge by his son's name (Roscius Potitus Memmianus, c.v.)³⁷. Seia is described as 'mater Rosci Potiti Memmiani, c.v.', rather than as a wife or daughter, presumably because both husband and father were already deceased at the time the dedication to her was erected. (She had herself recently died - the stone describes her as c.m.f.). The same is evidently true for Aelia Celsinilla (B107) - the only group (B) patrona not so far discussed - whom a statue base names as 'consularis femina, patrona perpetua, mater Celsiniani consularis viri curatoris sui'. Her father, generally deemed to be the hapless Aelius Celsus, who backed the wrong side in the Severan civil wars, was certainly dead by this time, and as mother of a consul, Aelia must herself have been at least in her late fifties, thus feasibly outliving her husband. Although the town of Thuburbo Minus may have elected to set up a statue to Aelia in connection with her son's curatorship, it would be perverse to imagine that the occasion was also chosen to enrol her so belatedly as patron. As wife of a consul, and daughter of a senator important enough to be reckoned among the leaders of an anti-Severan clique, we must look elsewhere, and earlier, for the origins of Aelia's co-optation.³⁸

³⁵ The texts are to be published by M. Corbier and A. Beschtaouch in 'Bulla Regia', École Française de Rome et I.N.A.A. de Tunis, cf. Tituli V p.690 n.14. For Furcilia and her family, cf. Tituli V pp.691, 693, 713.

³⁶ Tituli V p.693.

³⁷ For the Roscian link, note the names of P. Aradius Roscius Rufinus Saturninus Tiberianus (possibly identical to two other Aradii Roscii (cf. Tituli V p.713)) and his daughter [Aradia] Roscia [-] ne [-]e (?) [-] Calpurnia Purgilla.

³⁸ Links with the Aradii may also be surmised. Her granddaughter, Agria Tannonia, c.p. was awarded a statue at Bulla Regia during her son's curatorship of the town (C25523), and Aelia herself appears to be the object of a fragmentary statue base from the town (AE (1953) 84). The family evidently owned property in Bulla Regia as well as Thuburbo Minus. Some connection by marriage or adoption with the Aradii also seems probable (cf. the name [-]Ara]dius Pa[ter]nus Rufi[nia]nus Aelia[nus Iu?]n., c.p., son of Furcilia Optata T[iberia?]na.

The dedication of a statue at Avioccata to Oscia Modesta [-]ia[-]ia Cornelia Patruina Publana, M.f. (B113), whose building liberality has already been noticed, may also have coincided with an African office held by her son. Himself 'civis et patronus', C. Arrius Calpurnius Longinus, C.f. Quir. (C114) was honoured with a statue whilst leg(atus) Karthaginis, or soon afterwards³⁹. If civic pride occasioned by Longinus' post resulted in the erection of both statues, there is no need to connect with this event the recent co-optation of either mother or son. As with Aelia Celsinilla, the eminence of Oscia's father and husband suffices to explain her own patronate. Oscia's epitaph at Rome vaunts her skill as poet, and her descent from the Scipios (IGRRP I336 cf. C6.1478). However tenuous either claim may have been, her father - who remains so far unknown - evidently was a formidable figure in his own right. Oscia's brilliant marriage into the powerful Arrii gives some insight into her father's connections. Her husband, C. Arrius Calpurnius Frontinus Honoratus, grandson of the Cirtan consul and confidant of Fronto, C. Arrius Antoninus, and himself consul shortly before his death, enjoyed both patrician status and immense wealth, with known holdings in Cirta, Rome, Pisidian Antioch, Thuburbo Maius and Avioccata. Arrius is unlikely to have been alive at the time the dedication was erected at Avioccata to his wife, even if this anteceded the dedication to her son, the consul and legatus Karthaginis. His demise occurred some 15 years or more anterior to the dedication to his son - he was already consularis memoriae vir whilst his son was c(larissimus) p(uer) (cf. ILA279) - and the dedication to Oscia does not describe her as his wife.

Parallels between all the three last mentioned patronae (Seia Potitia Consortiana, Aelia Celsinilla and Oscia Modesta) are remarkably close. At the time their appearance as patronae is first documented, all appear to have been widowed, and to have had sons who were clarissimi viri. In two instances, at least, their sons were (or rose to be) consuls, holding African posts. The fortunes of their sons reflect those of their husbands, two of whom were consuls, and the third - (Roscius) - a collateral of the

³⁹ It is uncertain whether Longinus' consulship coincided with the end of his term of office as legate of the Carthaginian diocese, or occurred some years later. Both posts are given on the text which mentions his patronate (C23831).

powerful Aradii. With the possible exception of Oscia Modesta, all three patronae were in their late fifties, at least, and in one case - that of Seia Potitia Consortiana - recently deceased. Their fathers - all shadowy figures, although evidently well connected, and of senatorial, if not consular rank, in two examples - may, therefore, be presumed to have died well before the erection of the dedications attesting their patronate⁴⁰. There is, therefore, a strong presumption that all three patronae experienced a critical juncture in their lives, when the demise of their father and husband cast them precipitously into the rôle of head of the family, with sole responsibility for the care of their extensive holdings, and for the welfare of sons of tender years, but high prospects. One consequence of these new responsibilities will have been an immediate enhancement of their importance within the communities in which they resided, and with whom increased interaction was inevitable. In recognition of their new rôle, and as a tribute to the memory of their family, local councils may have elected to confer upon them the patronate. This would create a third group of patronae to those co-opted as puellae (B146, C151,152 and possibly C79), or as wives of eminent clarissimi (C150,106,B110, and possibly 240 and 102). On the other hand, the prestige of their own families, and particularly of those into whom they married, would appear to qualify any of the three patronae of our purported third group for co-optation well anterior to their widowhood. The practice of co-opting dowagers - if it ever occurred - may be assumed to have been principally a back-up measure. All of the three patronae who were potentially co-opted as widows had young sons who - doubtless - would eventually and more effectively, assume their own patronal obligations. Until they were in a position to do so, the co-optation of their mothers would allow the community to retain a close association with the family through an adult intermediary. By reaffirming their loyalty in this manner, the community was also of course establishing a background of continuous patronal activity to be held up for emulation. Such activity was almost certainly initiated by

⁴⁰ This is certain for the father of Aelia Celsinilla, if he is to be identified with the senator killed by Severus, Aelius Celsus. The father of Seia Potitia Consortiana (B137) may have been equestrian rather than senatorial.

fathers or grandfathers, if not beyond. Their mothers, whether co-opted as widows - or, with foresight, earlier - were, for all the beneficia which might be anticipated from their co-optation, essentially passers of the bâton. The conceived rôle of patronae generally as conduits, may be gauged by the frequent epigraphic habit of describing them either as daughter of someone, or - equally commonly - as someone's mother. That the latter description could still be applied to two of our widowed patronae, whose children, as *clarissimus vir* (B137) and *consularis vir* (B107), had clearly been independent adults for some years, indicates how tenacious was the communal view that patronae were primarily important as bearers of sons. It is only a small step further to presume that their co-optation was principally motivated by this rather narrow consideration, in order to ensure continuity of patronage through the male line. The possibility exists that this consideration also underlay the co-optation of unmarried girls, although short term objectives - the flattery of a great house and the anticipation of links by marriage with a family of equal or greater standing - would appear sufficient motive.

The characterisation of patronae as daughter, or mother, of someone on dedications to them by the community was evidently standard epigraphic procedure⁴¹, to be dispensed with only when the dedication included mention of a father (C151, 152), or husband (C150, A257), or, perhaps (as may be the case with Oscia Modesta), when a joint dedication to father, husband or son, obviated the necessity⁴². Comparison may be made with children or youths to whom dedications were erected as patrons, in which they are similarly defined in terms of kinship, viz., as son (but sometimes also as grandson cf. B83). Again, when this relationship is not expressed, explanation lies in the nature of the text.⁴³

⁴¹ Six patronae are so described, three as daughters (B102 (=240), 146, C79), and three as mothers (B107, 108 and 137). Two patronae from unpublished texts (C106 and B110) can obviously not be discussed.

⁴² See above, for the possibility that the dedications to Oscia Modesta and her son at Avioccala were contemporary.

⁴³ Filial relationship expressed, (B83, 87, 88, 131, 141, 189, C63); unpublished text (C244); fragmentary text (B138, 139, 140); probable joint dedication (B97-8 - the honorand is patronus, patroni f., and B132 - cf. a dedication (by the ordo?) to the father found at neighbouring Bir Chana, C24058). The two other patrons attested as children or youths appear not in dedications by the ordo, but as recipient of a statue by his maiores in one instance (B136), and as dedicator of an epitaph in another (C286). *Clarissimae puellae*

PATRONS CO-OPTED AS CHILDREN OR YOUTHS

Nineteen municipal patrons in Africa are attested as such whilst only children or youths (14 from group (B) and five from group (C)).⁴⁴ Another ten patrons whose fathers are documented as being patrons, may also have acquired the patronate at an early age, and the same may apply for nine further patrons who appear to have been co-opted a parentibus⁴⁵.

Abundant as the evidence is for the frequency of conferring the patronate upon persons beneath the age of 25⁴⁶, there are few means of deducing even to an approximation, the age of any of those so attested. For the 19 patrons whose youth is

appear in one text with filial relationship expressed (B146), and in another without, but with both father and mother mentioned (as joint patrons) on the same text (C151, 152).

⁴⁴ See list (C), and add three clarissimae puellae (B146, C151 and 152) from list (B).

⁴⁵ (a) **Ten Patrons** - B39,40,46,99,168,223/4, 269 and (specifically named as patroni a parentibus) C79,82,134. Their fathers appear at B38 (B39 and 40), B45 (B46), C78 (C79), B99 (C82), B56 (B99), C222 (C223/4), B268 (B269), B133 (B134), B167 (B168).

(b) **Nine patrons** -

B55 (descendant(?) of B42).

B57 (son(?) of B69).

B66 (descendant (?) of B38, 39 and 40).

B75 (descendant (?) of B38, 39 and 40).

C114 (mother = patrona (B113), father probably also patron - see above p.176).

B117 (related to (?), or descendant of (?) B115, patron of neighbouring Uchi Maius).

B125 (descendant (?), perhaps grandson, of B33).

B192 (descendant (?) of Q. Octavius Gallus Concessianus (signo) Dynamius, c.p., possibly patron.

His brother is honoured by the ordo 'ob multa merita patris atque avi eius in patriam et in rem publicam, et honestas eorum munificentias liberalitates' (AE (1975) 878). His ancestors' munificence, and his own position as first senator of the family, are strong grounds for the candidacy of Candidianus as patron). B215-6 (grandson of Q. Aurelius Pactumeius Clemens, the brother of Africa's first consul, Q. Aurelius Pactumeius Fronto, both of whom are honoured at Cirta in fragmentary dedications, probably as patrons (ILAlg II642-4 cf. IB132,133)).

⁴⁶ In addition to the 38 patrons mentioned above, note two municipal patrons attested at the threshold of their senatorial career, one as quae[stor] design. (B 76) the other as quaestor (B236). As entry into the quaestorship was conditional upon having reached the age of 25, it is probable that both were 25 at the time the dedications were erected. Their age, in any case, is unlikely to have exceeded 30, and both may have been co-opted some time before the receipt of these dedications. In addition to the 9 clarissimi pueri known as municipal patrons, mention may also be made of a clarissimus puer, P. Messius Augustinus Maecianus, patron of the curiae (and the community?) of Pheradi Maius (PC3). Messius, whose father was also patron of the curiae (PC2), is described as 'equestris tribus honorib. functus'. H.G. Pflaum ('Carrières' n. 231 p.620) takes the post as being purely honorary, but cf. M. G. Jarrett, ('An Album of the Equestrians from North Africa in the Emperor's Service', Ep. Stud. 9 (1972) p.199 n.101) - 'If he actually served in the militiae (as 'functo' suggests), he was presumably recruited about the age of 18 at latest; his service may have been nominal, cf. no. 149 (a unique attestation of honorary militia (honoraria mili[t(ia)] ornatus) also from Africa'. Jarrett's view - based on the erroneous assumption that the title clarissimus puer might be retained until 25 (see now A. Chastagnol, 'Les femmes dans l'ordre sénatorial : titulature et rang social à Rome', Revue Historique, 262 (1979) p.5) - must now be dismissed in preference for that espoused by Pflaum.

certain, nine are *clarissimi pueri*, and three *clarissimae puellae*, implying an age below 17 & 15 respectively.⁴⁷

Two *clarissimi iuvenes* (one, B132 a c(larissimae) m(emoriae) i(uvenis)) indicate by their titles, an age between 17 and 25.⁴⁸ None of the five others bear equivalent titles, although one, whose only post is that of *salius Collinus*, was by definition below the age of 25⁴⁹. The youth of one of the remaining 4 patrons (C286) is apparent from his (prospective) office - *militiae petitor* - and an age in his high teens would suit. For the others, an age anterior to 25 is suggested by a combination of two factors, an absence of any *cursus* and their description as son of a particular person

⁴⁷ The title *clarissimus puer* was, from the reign of Marcus, the normal title of senatorial children not having attained the *toga virilis* (cf. A. Chastagnol, *op. cit.*, pp.7-8). This important event normally occurred at or about the age of 17 (*ibid.*, p.5, cf. J.P.V.D. Balsdon, 'Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome, New York, 1969, pp.120-121). *Clarissimi pueri* are attested from their earliest infancy, cf. A. Chastagnol, *op. cit.*, p.7 n.22 citing C6.1458 (6 months 21 days) and C12.5804 (13 months). *Clarissimae puellae* also first attested under Marcus, are likewise known to have carried this designation whilst very young (cf. *ibid.*, p.13 and n.52 citing C6.1334 (45 days). The assumption of the title *clarissima femina* occurred when *clarissimae puellae* married senators (or equestrians and plebeians, cf. *ibid.*, p.13 ff.). For the marriage of senatorial girls at the age of 14-15 as *de rigeur*, see most recently R. Syme (cited above n.20).

⁴⁸ The youngest known *clarissimus iuuenis* (about 17 years of age) appears on a dedication to him by a slave 'ob honorem togae virilis' (C6.2089, cited by A. Chastagnol, *op. cit.*, p.7 n. 19 and cf. D1083). Others are attested at the ages of 20 and 21 (cf. C2.112). The assumption of the title *clarissimus vir* appears to have been associated with entry into the quaestorship (cf. *ibid.*, p.7), i.e. at 25 or soon after (see n.46 above). Several texts record *clarissimi viri*, whose only office was quaestor, or quaestor designatus (e.g. D1131-2, C5.7782, C8.18907-8, 5528). On the other hand, the appearance of c.i. in the *cursus* of the earliest attested *clarissimus iuuenis* (AD118), L. Fulvius Alburnius Valens (pontifex, praefect. urbi feriarum Latinar. factus ab imp. Hadriano Aug. II cos. III vir a.a.a.f.f., quaest. Aug., tribunus plebis designatus candidatus Aug., eq. publ., c.i.- cf. C6.1421 = D1051) is clearly out of order and appears to have been added later. Also aberrant are two cases of *clarissimi pueri*, respectively questor (sic) Kandidatus designatus and q(uaestor) k(andidatus) (C6.6993 = D1201 and C10.1697 = D1226). Either the title c.p. is wrong (thus A. Chastagnol, *op. cit.*, p. 8n.23) or the extremely early candidacy to the quaestorship was a signal honour attributable to the importance of their fathers and to the late (fourth century) date of both texts. For examples of an occasional cavalier attitude in epigraphic attestations of the title *clarissimus*, note a *clarissimus vir* aged 18 (C9.2340), and even 13 (C6.1537). Despite their youth, however, the two c(larissimae) m(emoriae) f(eminiae) who both died at 16, may have had - if married - legitimate claim to the title contra G. Barbieri ('Albo Senatorio da Settimo Severo a Carino,' Roma (1952) n.2187. (C6.31730). The ascription of the title *clarissimus iuuenis* to a person of 29 years and 11 months (C6.1538) cited by A. Chastagnol, *op. cit.*, p.7 n.19) may also be legitimate, as he had not attained the quaestorship. Among posts held by *clarissimi iuvenes* (other than those cited for L. Fulvius Alburnius Valens cited above) are curio (AE(1945)22), III vir viarum curandarum (C2.112), III vir capitalis (C11.3253, 5331), X vir stlitibus iudicandis (C3.1988-9), XV vir sacris faciundis (C5.4340), tribunus militum legionis (D1152, C5.2331, 3.1985, 4558, 5.5032, 6.1433, AE(1912) 17), sacerdos urbis Romae aeternae and flamen perpetuus (C8.24054). All of the above posts, bar the last two, were regularly occupied prior to tenure of the quaestorship. The last two posts, both priesthoods, may belong to the father of the *iuuenis*. No other senator is attested as flamen in Africa until the C5, and both cases are doubtful. (For the *clarissimi* Flavius Arpagius and [-] Rufinianus (C909, 24069), whose flaminiate was presumably either honorary, or held prior to the acquisition of senatorial rank, see C. Lepelley, 'Les cités, I p.268 and p.270.)

⁴⁹ Paulys Real-Encyclopädie II, I Sal.ii col. 1181-3, cited by F. Bertrand, *op. cit.*, p.12n.41- 'l'age d'admission est très variable entre 7 et 24 ans'.

⁵⁰ On the other hand, descriptions of *clarissimi viri* as sons (and even grandsons) of someone, while rare, do occur (cf. D1131-2). Such indications derive in part from a desire to advertise the status and political successes of the person's maiores, but are perhaps also a heritage of the near absolute powers of the pater familias (see J.P.V.D. Balsdon, *op. cit.*, p.117 - 'A son was as much in the potestas of his father after marriage as he had been before it').

whose name is given in full⁵⁰. They comprise a *procos. filius* (C63=B80-81?), an *e.v. patr[oni fil]lius* (B189), and a *II viralici filius* (B141).

Only six of the 19 patrons aged below 25 have fathers whose patronate of the same community can be documented⁵¹. Two possible additions are (1) C. Vettius Gratus Atticus Sabinianus *c.p.* (B83), whose grandfather C. Vettius Sabinianus Julius Hospes, *C.f. Volt.* (B64-5) is attested as patron of neighbouring Thuburbo Maius (15 km. by air to the south) and (2) Q. Appaeus Felix Flavianus (*signo*) He [-]e[-], *Q.f.*, [*c.p.* or *c.i.*] (B132), whose father's patronate may have been detailed on a lacunary text erected to him (by the *ordo*?) at adjacent Bîr Chana (C24054). Of the 11 patrons who remain, the fathers of 4 (B136,138,139 and 140) are completely unknown, and the fathers of a further five known only from the texts erected to their children as patrons, and their mention has no other purpose than to express filiation (B87,88,131,141,146). The fathers of the remaining two patrons (C63 and 235) who also appear purely in a context of expressing filiation, are attested from elsewhere, but not from the community where their son was patron.⁵² As has been seen (p.71) where persons are introduced on dedications by the *ordo* to a near relative, solely to express their relationship with the recipient, omission of *patrocinium* carries no inference of non-co-optation. There is no need therefore to assume that any of the 14 patrons beneath the age of 25 whose father's patronate is unattested were the first members of their family to be co-opted. The extreme youth of nine (eight *pueri* -

⁵¹ B97-8, C151, 152, 189, 244, 286. B97-8 and C189 are each termed *patroni filius*.

⁵² (1) Q. Servilius Pudens, *procos. Africae* and father of the homonymous patron of Bisica Lucana (C63), himself probably identical to the patron of Calama (B80-1) is attested indirectly in a dedication to his wife at Tuccabor (37 km. north-west from Bisica Lucana by air), (IC7d). A fragmentary dedication to a Q. Servilius Pudens at Althiburos (C27782) may refer either to the proconsul or his son (cf. IC7,8). The former presumably acquired several African clients either through family holdings and connections in the province (as potential cognates of the Servilii Silani the family's origins are tentatively assigned to Hippo Regius, cf. M. Corbier, *Tituli V* p.721) or in his capacity as proconsul. The establishment of African clients may have had earlier origins - a legate of the proconsul of Africa in AD78, another Q. Servilius Pudens, is conjecturally assigned the patronate of Hippo Regius by E. Marec. The text is lacunary (see E. Marec, 'Le Forum de Hippone', *Libyca*, II (1954) pp.384-5 = *AE* (1949) 76, (1951)82, (1955) 147 see ICI).

(2) C. Iulius Erucius Clarus Vibianus, consul of 193, apart from the text describing him as father of (B235), patron of Diana Veteranorum, appears in African epigraphy only when his consulate is made a dating reference (e.g. *AE* (1979) 671).

B83,87,88,131,136,138,139,140, and a puella - B146)⁵³ suggests that their co-optation at least was predicated upon their father's, particularly in the case of four whose fathers were of senatorial rank (B83,87,88, and 146)⁵⁴. It may be that young persons were sometimes the first of their family to be honoured with the patronate, in recognition of their elevation to a higher social status, as perhaps for the c(larissimus) p(uer) (B131) and c(larissimae) m(emoriae i(uvenis) (B132), whose fathers, both equestrians, are not known to have been co-opted. Examples can, however, be adduced of parents and children of differing social status sharing the patronate, although the elevation of the younger generation is not from equestrian to senator, but from municipal office holder to equestrian (B38 and 39, B285 and 286) or to Carthaginian magistrate (B38 and 40). If it is not possible to state that the co-optation of all young patrons was always dependant upon the earlier or co-eval co-optation of their father, it may be assumed to be the norm both from the parallel case of patronae (whose co-optation was regularly predicated upon that of a husband or father) and the existence of at least 16 municipal patrons with fathers as patrons⁵⁵. A possible exception to the norm - the age at co-optation of the son being, however, unknown - is the curious case of the Titinii from Cuicul. The ordo erected non-lacunary dedications to both the father (a local and a procurator in the region) and to the son (a flamen), yet only the latter is described as patron, despite the fact that he appears not to have inherited his father's status (C247). Two local patrons, however, may confidently be put forward as the first of their family to be co-opted, both of whom were clearly viri at the time dedications to them were erected. Co-optation may have anteceded the date of these dedications, but is unlikely to have occurred prior to the offices which these texts attest for them. For M. Attius Cornelianus, patron of Uchi Maius (B115), this office was the prestigious command of the praetorian guard, a position whereby he was doubtless able to effect the 'incomparabilis erga patriam et cives amor' for which

⁵³ The puella is herself filia of a clarissimus, ^{iuvenis,} i.e. beneath the age of 10. See above (n.47) for the age of clarissimi iuvenes.

⁵⁴ The fathers of four are of unknown rank (B136,138,139,140), and of another (B131) proc. Aug., e.v..

⁵⁵ To the six patrons cited above whose youth is certain, add the 10 patrons of unknown age whose fathers are known as patrons (see n.45).

he is extolled. For L. Marcius Simplex, Q. f. Arn., patron of nearby Thugga (B58), the office concerned was rather that of juror in the five decuries, than his earlier Carthaginian magistracies, since the 'egregia munificentia' for which he is praised, is clearly to be connected to his joint donation of the Capitol with a relative (also patron), when already adlected as juror⁵⁶. Separate statues were erected by the respective ordines of Uchi Maius and Thugga to the fathers of both men, L. Attius Exoratus (C26271) and Q. Marcius Maximus, Quir. (C26605), neither of whom are termed patron. The latter's statue is specifically stated to have been erected 'ob munificentiam L. Marci Simplicis fili eius et ob ipsius merita', and an almost identical phrase appears on a statue base erected to a brother of Simplex, C. Marcius Clemens, Q. f. Arn., who is likewise not described as patron (C26604). The primary objective behind the erection of both statues was clearly to honour Simplex, and the dedication to Cornelianus' father was similarly no doubt principally designed to honour the son⁵⁷. Although the text praises only Exoratus ('ob singularem amorem in patriam et simplicem vitam'), it is revealing that he is defined not by any office, but as father of Cornelianus, who, conversely, appears without filiation on the dedication set up to him. In Italy and the provinces outside of Africa, as in Africa itself, it is not possible to establish with any certainty the existence of patrons below the age of 25 whose career, status or contacts enabled them to become the first member of their family co-opted, although junior members of the imperial family are probable candidates. The difficulty of establishing first patron of the family status for persons below 25 is, however, extreme, given the absolute rarity of the *prima facie* evidence, viz. a statue to that patron's father erected by the ordo which does not detail the father's patronate.

⁵⁶ The texts recording this donation (C15513 and 15514) describe neither L. Marcius Simplex nor his son (or cousin?) L. Marcius Simplex Regillianus as patron. The latter is only known as patron by a text erected to his wife (whose name is lost) '[in sol]acium....mariti eius' by the ordo (C22610). The text clearly postdates the erection of the Capitol, since Regillianus is named for the first time princeps.

⁵⁷ cf. addenda to C26271: 'Titulus dedicavit Attio Exorato, sine dubio in honorem filii'.

The Inheritance Clause of *Tabulae Patronatus*.

Its application to the children and descendants of local patrons.

It is clear from the terms of African *tabulae patronatus* - which, with minor variations, repeat the clause 'eumque et posteros eius sibi posterisque suis patronum cooptaverunt' until the high fourth century - that all a patron's children and descendants ought to have enjoyed automatic entitlement to the patronate. It has already been observed, however, that the clause was a dead letter in the case of children of non-local administrators, unless they themselves also held office (pp.52-3). None can be detected as patrons either in Africa or elsewhere in the empire, and the existence of statue bases to them by communities where their father was patron, wherein they are not titled patron, is certain indication that non-co-optation was frequent, if not the rule.

On the other hand, there is abundant evidence - from Africa and Italy in particular - to substantiate the view that the co-optation of a local patron's children was common practice. Proof of the patronate beyond the second generation is necessarily less easily come by, but (contra Engesser, 'Der Stadtpatronate', p.50) examples can be drawn from Italy and (less discernibly) from Africa. In Africa 16 local patrons, 14 men and 2 women (including one couple), attest 18 children who are themselves secured as patrons⁵⁸. This figure can be augmented by most, if not all, of the 10 local men whose patronate, while unconfirmed, can be deduced from that of their 13 children, all beneath the age of 25⁵⁹. This is especially probable for the six whose nine children were mere *pueri*, or (as in one case) a *puella*⁶⁰. For Italy, the figures are considerably higher, in keeping with a documented total of patrons over twice that of Africa's. Thirty six fathers of local origin are found as patrons in association with (or perhaps

⁵⁸ cf. list (D). Parents are B38,45,56, C78, B96, 99, 113, 133, C149, 150, B167, 188, 222, 243, 268, 285. Their children are B39, 40, 46, 99, C79, B97-8, C82,114, B134, C151,152, 168, B189, 223-4, 244, 269, 286.

⁵⁹ The fathers of C63 (Q. Servilius Pudens, cos. 166), B131 (C. Vettius Gratus Sabinianus, cos.221), B87 and 88 (L. Baburius Iuvenis, c.v.), B131 (L. Caesius Marcellus, proc. Aug. e.v.), B132 (Q. Appaeus Saturninus Iuventianus, P. fil. Ter., e.v.), B136 (Annaeus), B138,139,140 (anon.), B141 (Latinus Felicianus, II viralicus), B146 (P. Aradius Roscius Rufinus Saturn[i]nus Tiberianus, c.i.), B235 (C. Iulius Erucius Clarus Vibianus, cos.193).

⁶⁰ Fathers of *pueri* (B83,87 and 88-131,136,138,139 and 140); of a *puella* (B146).

prior to) their 39 sons⁶¹. Again the real figure should be swollen by the addition of the fathers of young patrons below the age of 25, whose own patronate is unattested (17 fathers of 17 sons)⁶².

Potentially, the total number of documented local patrons who were parent and child is high, 26 parents with 31 children from Africa, and 53 parents with 56 children from Italy. On the other hand, there exists an almost equally large number of patrons from both provinces whose children are known but not attested as patrons, and - inevitably - a much greater number of patrons whose children have left no epigraphic trace in their patria or its locale at all. The latter group may be passed over, except only to comment on how large a proportion of attested local patrons they actually form. In Africa, for almost 4/5 of all local patrons (138/171)⁶³, children are either not known at all, or only known (as in a few instances), from a provenance far from their patria.

Most problematical are the patron's children whose patronate is not mentioned on texts from or near their patria. In Africa, 29 children of 22 patrons are not themselves attested as patrons⁶⁴, but in only two of these examples, are we permitted to draw the conclusion that the individual was not - at least at the time of the dedication - patron of their parent's client community. A comparative list drawn up by Engesser ('Der Stadtpatronat', p.49) for the children of patrons from all provinces, divides them into two groups, approximately equal in size, group (1) comprising those who were patrons and group (2) those whose patronate is unattested. Apart from the deficiency of omission (six African examples from group (A), and 15 from group (B)), the list includes grandchildren as well as children in group (B) (cf. n.89, 534 and 860) and fails to differentiate between local patrons and non-local patrons serving as administrators⁶⁵. No attempt, moreover, is made by Engesser to distinguish between

⁶¹ cf. list (F) for the names of 35 of the children (note that n.12 and 3, 20 and 21 and 24 and 25 on this list are brothers) and add from list (E) the names of a further four children (n.12, 13, 16 and 21 on this list).

⁶² cf. list (E) for the names of the 17 children (n.1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24 and 25 on this list, excluding n.12,13,16 and 21 (see note above) and n.3,4,10 and 11, non-local juvenile members of the imperial family).

⁶³ Reference numbers are given in list (G), part (A).

⁶⁴ Reference numbers are given in list (G), part (B). Details of inscription types follow in list (H).

⁶⁵ Engesser's omissions from his group G(1) are B99, 133, 167, 222, C243, B268, and from his group (2) B7, 64-5, 69, 75?, 85, 107, 108, 110?, 118, 126, 137, 245, C297, B298,299. See list (G). The African

the various inscription types on which the children of patrons appear, failure to mention the patronate on a text being casually equated with non-co-optation in every instance. A correspondingly high total of children of patrons in his group (2) thus enables the conclusion that failure to meet the obligations of the 'inheritance clause' was a frequent phenomenon (*ibid.*, p.50).

The clearest confirmation of non-co-optation - the dedication of a statue to an individual by the *ordo*, with no indication of the recipient's patronate - occurs only twice for the children of local African patrons. The recipients are Aurelia Dionysia, daughter of Aurelius Dionysius patron of Giufi (C23995 = B148) and C. Valerius Gallia[n]us Honoratian[us, i(uvenis)] c(larissimus), patroni f[il(ius)], son of Valerius Rogatianus patron of Uzappa (C11935 = B118). Dionysia's mother was also accorded a statue by the *ordo* of Giufi (C866). She is not termed patron, but 'Aurelli Dionysi patroni coniunx', just as her daughter is 'Aureli Dionysi patroni filia'. Other examples of local patron's daughters being accorded statues by the *ordo* without mention of their patronate occur in sufficient numbers from Italy to suggest that female descendants of patrons could not automatically anticipate co-optation⁶⁶. In fact the low number of attested patronae generally (13 in Africa and 7 in Italy), only four of whom are known to have derived their patronate from their father (C79,151,152 and (probably)B146) indicates regular discrimination by co-opting communities, regardless of the wording of the 'inheritance clause' of *tabulae patronatus*, where, of course, no such distinction is made. We need not doubt that the same process of rigid selectivity was applied to the wives of patrons, for whom the 'inheritance clause' did not apply, as well as the daughters. Other wives of patrons than Aurelius Dionysius' are known

examples I exclude from Engesser's list are (his reference numbers) from Group (1) - n.67 and 68 (group (A) patrons), n.115 and 116 (patrons of *curiae* not of the *municipium*) and n.126 and 127 (see under *incerti*, IB61,62) and from Group (2) - n.89 (granddaughter of a patron) and n.201, 249 and 250 (all group (A) patrons).

⁶⁶ Six examples are known

- (1) Flavia Rufina (C14.2921).
- (2) Antonia Picentina, Cn.f., *sacerdos divae Faustinae* (C9.5428)).
- (3) Petronia Sabina (D1386).
- (4) Iulia Lucilia (C11.4090).
- (5) Varia Gestiana, L.f. (C11.5175) who is also the wife of a patron.
- (6) Clodia Anthianilla, L.f., *splendidissima puella* (AE (1910) 203).

from statues erected to them by the ordo, wherein no mention of their patronate is made⁶⁷. We might finally repeat the observation - applicable both to wives and daughters of patrons - that the means whereby women might be of service to the community were under severe restrictions, with consequent disadvantages to their candidature as patrons.

The case of C. Valerius Gallia[n]us Honoratianus is fundamental to the whole issue of the application of the 'inheritance clause' in Africa. Pragmatic reasons for waiving the clause, such as can be adduced for the daughters and female descendants of local patrons, or for the children and descendants of non-local administrators, are unlikely to have impeded the co-optation of Honoratianus. As a local senator and benefactor, whose grandfather, father and brother were generous to the community and whose father and (probably) brother were patrons⁶⁸, he would seem eminently qualified. Although there are lacunae on the stone, none allow for the possibility that Honoratianus was described as patron.

Only four alternatives present themselves. Firstly, due to the iteration involved in the phrase 'patrono, patroni filius', 'patrono' may simply have dropped out by a mason's error. This option must be regarded as a last resort. Secondly, owing to Honoratianus' youth (he was a '[i(u)venis] c(larissimus)') the senator of Uzappa may have deferred his co-optation until some significant and propitious moment, the advent of his cursus, or his entry into manhood, for example. That local senates in Africa allowed themselves the final say in the timing (at least)⁶⁹ of the co-optation of patrons' sons, is manifest in the case of the son of a certain Cincius Victor, patron of Thugga (B45). The son, M. Cincius Felix Iulianus (B46), was co-opted only after Victor's restoration of a portico, and sundry accompanying benefactions, a piece of

⁶⁷ e.g. Papia Novella, Q.f. wife of C. Iulius Commodus Orfitianus patron of Simitthu (ILT 1259 = B51), and in Italy, Varia Pansina, wife and sister of patrons (AE (1971) 85) and Varia Gestiana, wife and daughter of patrons (C11.5175). It is also clear from the dedication to her daughter by the ordo that Seia Quintilia was not patron (C9.5428).

⁶⁸ The text is erected to Honoratianus '[o]b amorem eius[de]m et Valerior (um) [G]allian[i] avi et Rogatiani patris et V[-] pa [-] frat[ri]s'. The extension of the lacuna to read V[er]i? or V[ictoris?] etc. followed by 'pa[troni] frat[ri]s' seems almost obligatory.

⁶⁹ See pp.195-7 for the more likely proposition that only a proportion of non-senatorial children of patrons were ever themselves co-opted.

munificence specifically stated to have occurred when Victor was already patron ('cum....iam pridem patronus factus esset'). As an additional act of kindness, Victor marked the occasion of his son's co-optation with a statue to Fortuna. An interval of at least a year, possibly several, thus appears to have set apart the co-optation of father and son. Although the son is said to have been co-opted 'propter eiusdem Cinci Victoris merita quae circa r.p. suam et universos cives exhibuisset', it cannot be determined whether the father's liberality resulted in a decision by the ordo to co-opt the son, or merely to expedite that co-optation. As the text gives neither the office nor rank of father or son, it is possible that the son-like Honoratianus - was quite young at the time his co-optation occurred⁷⁰. Conferment of the patronate on a patron's son does not always seem to have been preceded by munificence on the part of the father. This may be surmised from the Gabinii, another family of patrons from Thugga who also happened to be benefactors (B38-40). The extensive benefactions known for the family, however, all clearly postdate the co-optation of at least one son, A. Gabinius Datus filius (B39). Known as patron whilst only flam(en) divi Titi Aug(usti) (ILA569), the family's generous provision of temple complexes all date to a time when he appears with several additional posts to his cursus, and augmentation to equestrian status (ILT1391).

Deferment of the patronate of a patron's son or daughter was clearly optional, to judge from the numerous examples of pueri and puellae known as patrons, and whose co-optation was doubtless co-eval with that of their parent(s). In Africa, the only evidence that children of patrons may have been co-opted at an older age (as iuvenes, or even adults) comes from dedications in their honour by the ordo, but these are an unreliable indicator, as their erection may have been prompted by other factors. Thus, recent benefactions, or a return home after completion of studies or other duties in the capital or abroad may account for some honorific statues so erected. Nevertheless,

⁷⁰ On this text and its importance on this issue, see M. Engesser, *op. cit.*, pp.52, and L. Harmand, *op. cit.*, pp.313-4. Note that the son appears on an epitaph erected near Thugga where he is described as v.e., aedil(is), II viral(icius) c(oloniae) I(uliae) K(arthaginis) (C27420). Some influential function, possibly advocatus at Carthage, seems required for Victor, from the expression 'ad tuendam' rempublic(am) suam' applied to his co-optation (C1548).

these statues exist in sufficient quantity to suggest that some at least coincided with the recipients' actual co-optation. Unfortunately, we can very rarely date any honorific statues by the *ordo* to patron's children as being later than the inscription on which their parents appear as patron. Proof of deferred patronate for patron's children of mature or adult years is thus made the more difficult, by the possibility that the parents were not co-opted themselves until late in life, when their children were accordingly older.

Only from Italy does firm evidence exist for the co-optation of *iuvenes* or *viri* with fathers as patrons. The texts - fourth century *tabulae patronatus* - also indicate that some time (possibly a considerable interval) intervened before the patron's son was confirmed in his own patronate. One *tabula* concerns the 'honestissimus vir' Helpidius, and explicitly states that the *ordo* of Paestum had already conferred *tabulae* on his parents ('*tabulam patronatus sic uti parentibus eius optulimus offeramus*' - C10.478).⁷¹ A second *tabula* records the co-optation of the *iuvenis* C. Sallius Sofronius *iun(ior)* by 'universi pagani seu vicani Forulani' (AE (1937)121). Sallius, his father C. Sallius Sofronius Pompeianus, p.v., and earlier members of the gens are described both on this *tabula* and on another erected by the *ordo* of Amiternum to Sallius' father (AE(1937)119), as patrons of Amiternum. The co-optation of Sallius by the pagani seu vicani Forulani may reasonably be interpreted as following soon after that by the *ordo* of Amiternum, since the Forulani describe Amiternum as '*patria n(ostra)*.' Sallius' father was clearly of mature years himself (a *iuvenis* or *vir*) at the time his own patronate was proposed and confirmed, since the *tabula* on which this is recorded mentions specific costly and large-scale liberalities (AE (1937)119). In like manner, Aurelius Euagrius, son and grandson of patrons, and recipient of a *tabula patronatus* at Cluvium (AE(1975)367), was evidently at least a *iuvenis* at the moment of his co-optation, as seems confirmed by the numerous instances of his generosity (*benignitas*) and diligence (*industria*) towards the community⁷².

⁷¹ See L. Harmand, p.313 for this text.

⁷² cf. A. La Regina 'Cluvienses Carricini', *Arch. Class.*,25-6 (1973-4), pp.331-40.

All the four texts cited are testimony to the fact that separate tabulae were drawn up for parents and children in fourth century Italy, even when, as in two of our examples, the patrons are said to have derived their patronate 'ex origine prisca' (AE(1937)119) or 'veteri tesitmonio'(sic) (AE(1975)367), phrases reminiscent of other expressions employed to vaunt the lineage of one's patronate - 'a parentibus' in Africa, or 'ab origine', 'originalis' and other more splendid variants in Italy.⁷³ It is to be remarked that all these terms, with one (mid third century?) exception (one of the two patroni a parentibus from Africa, B133) appear only in the fourth century. During this century (later in Africa than in Italy) the 'inheritance clause' of tabulae patronatus ('posteris eius sibi posterisque suis' in Africa, 'domus suae' in Italy) fell into abeyance, for reasons that are no longer clear. The age was, however, one of chronic over-regulation of municipal affairs, and objection to the perpetuation of a contractual formula whose stipulations had only ever been loosely applied, was perhaps inevitable. The example of deferred patronate for the son of Cincius Victor in the mid-second century makes it improbable that the abolition of this clause heralded the introduction of separate tabulae for patron's children. One must imagine that separate tabulae were always conferred in cases where an interval of time elapsed between the co-optation of a patron and his children. The block provisions of the 'inheritance

-
- | | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|------------------|
| 73 (1) patronus a parentibus | - | Utika (C1182-B134) | |
| | - | Bulla Regia (C25525 = C168) | |
| (2) patronus ab origine | - | Beneventum (C9.1568-9) | = list (F) n.2 |
| | | Surrentum (10.681) | = list (F)n.9 |
| | | Capua (C10.3857) | = list (F) n.13 |
| | | Puteoli (C10.1702) | = list (F) n.24 |
| | | Puteoli (C10.1815) | = list (E) n.21 |
| (3) patronus originalis | - | Neapolis (D89844) | = list (F) n.2 |
| | | Neapolis (D8985) | = list (F) n.18 |
| | | Capua (AE (1972)143) | = list (F) n.24 |
| | | Capua (AE (1972)76) | = list (F) n.6 |
| (4) porro ab origine patronus | - | Suessa (C10.4755) | = list (F) n.16 |
| (5) patronus longe a maioribus originalis | - | Capua (C10.3860) | = list (F) n.25 |
| (6) patronus generis et originis | - | Abella (C10.1201) | = list (F) n.30 |
| (7) ab atavis patronus | - | Beneventum (C9.1591) | = list (F) n.33 |
| (8) a maioribus suis inlustribusq. familiis civitatis patronus | - | Saena (6.1793) | = list (F) n.35 |
| (9) ab avo et maioribus collegi et civitatis patronus | - | Beneventum (C9.1684) | = list (F) n.34. |
| (10) ex origine patronatus veniens | - | Interamna Lirenas (C10.5349) | = list (F) n.27 |
| (11) ex origine prisca cooptemus | - | Amitemum (AE(1937)119) | = list (F)n.26 |
| (12) veteri tesitmonio (sic) patrono (=patroni) | - | Cluvium (AE(1975)367) | = list (F) n.5 |
| (13) patronus ab maioribus | - | Ferentinum (C10.5850) | = list (F) n.36. |

clause' in fact appear to have been at best guidelines, with no legal efficacy and co-optation was probably always formalised on an individual basis, even where co-optation of parents and children was co-eval or nearly so.

Practical considerations, rather than legally binding conditions drawn into contracts with their father, suffice to explain the large numbers of patrons' children whose own patronate is attested. Frequent and convenient as the practice may have been, several texts illustrate that in Italy at least, a patron's son might not enjoy automatic entitlement to the patronate. The existence of these texts suggests two further alternatives, for the failure of the dedication to Honoratianus to describe him as patron.

The first, is that communities on occasion co-opted only a patron's eldest son, thus disqualifying Honoratianus, whose (elder?) brother Valerius V [-], seems to have been patron (see n.68). The second, is that Uzappa simply passed over Honoratianus as patron, no community being bound either by law or tradition to co-opt patron's sons per se, even though their social status be that of senator. The first of these alternatives seems less likely in Honoratianus' case, as a very similar dedication to that erected to Honoratianus is known from the same community, and honours a younger son of the legate Q. Anicius Faustinus. The recipient, also a clarissimus iuuenis, is termed 'patronus, patroni f(ilius)', Honoratianus merely 'patroni f[il(ius)]' (see B97-8, Sex. Anicius Faustus Paulinianus). Some 50 years separate the 2 dedications. The differing fortunes of both clarissimi iuvenes may have owed to the greater name of the Anician gens. Honoratianus did, however, rise to the important function of curator of Carthage, as a later text from that city proclaims (C12522).

As we shall see presently, from the example of M. Tineius Ovinus Castus Pulcher, neither patronal descent nor high senatorial office necessarily predetermined co-optation. The Italian evidence for the co-optation of a patron's eldest son only, rests on two texts C9.3314(=D5056) from Superaequum and C9.2600 (=D6523) from Terventum⁷⁴. In the former, two quattuorviri quinquennales, L. Vibius Severus and

⁷⁴ On these texts, see L. Harmand, pp.311-2. Harmand is obviously in error in assuming that the practice of only co-opting elder sons may have had a universal application. The numerous examples of sibling patrons (see list (D) for Africa) render any such assumption absurd.

L. Vibius Nepos, father and son, are recorded as patrons on a dedication commemorating the aedileship of a younger son, L. Vibius Rutilus, not described as patron. The context of the dedication might just possibly be said not to have required mention of Rutilus' patronate. The same does not apply to the omission of the patronate of another aedile, C. Pomponius Vitalis. The text is a joint epitaph to Vitalis and his brother C. Pomponius Marcellinus, erected by their father C. Pomponius Vitalis senior. Vitalis senior and Marcellinus alone are described as patrons, though the cursus of all three persons in the text is evidently given in full. The brothers of both Rutilus and Vitalis junior are clearly elder by their more advanced status or cursus⁷⁵, and it may be that their co-optation hinged on just such an advancement. Like their younger brothers, both had held the aedileship, a post regularly occupied by iuvenes, but unlike them, had gone on to occupy the post of IIII vir iur. d. in one instance (L. Vibius Nepos) and the rank of equo publico in the other (C. Pomponius Marcellinus). It may, therefore, be surmised that advancement to a similar position by the younger brothers would ensure their own passage into the patronate. Alternatively, the catalyst may have been their entry into manhood at (approximately) the age of 25⁷⁶. In either case, all municipal office holders from Italy who are known as patrons held functions superior to that of aedile. The evidence thus far for the practice of not co-opting young sons of patrons is too open to interpretation to be considered satisfactory.

Other texts from Italy, however, make it perfectly apparent that some patrons' sons who had attained the age of 25 and beyond did not themselves become patrons. Two of the texts concern II viri whose fathers were patrons of Misenum (C10.3678 = D5689) and Ostia (C14.4622), another a consul, who was both son and grandson of patrons of Tibur (C14.3614). There are besides, three dedications to the sons of

⁷⁵ L. Vibius Nepos is aed., IIII vir iur. d., eq. R., and C. Pomponius Marcellinus, equo publico (see list (J) n.6 and 7).

⁷⁶ Note that L. Vibius Rutilus was not only aedile, but eq(ues) R(omanus), and that C. Pomponius Vitalis was also flamen divi Vespasiani. Neither equestrian rank nor the flamine are inconsistent with an age below 25 (cf. for example C 2112 and 1649 for epitaphs to a flaminica and flamen aged 15 and 18 respectively).

patrons whose age cannot be established (C14.209 = D6189, Bovillae; C9.4067 = D6538, Carsioli; C11.5175, Urvinum Hortense) and another to an aedile, possibly a iuvenis, whose father was patron of Ausculum (C9.669). The dedications in all cases fail to mention the recipient's patronate, although the context would seem to logically require it, were it held. For these four last mentioned sons of patrons, whose age may have been below 25, later co-optation prior to the entry to manhood at least remains a possibility. For the pair of II viri and the consul, one is left to assume either that the patronate had passed them by, or that they preferred - for reasons not readily gauged - not to undertake the honour.

The failure of the II vir T. Fl(avius) Avitus Forensis to attain the patronate of Misenum, is clear from the nature of the text, a dedication by the ordo in his honour to commemorate a recent benefaction, in which he is designated 'filius T. Fl. Aviti, v.e., patron(i) col(oniae)'. Forensis is, moreover, not simply II vir, but II vir iter qq., omnib(us) munerib(us) functus. The second II vir, P. Aufidius Fortis, whose cursus is likewise apparently given in full (II vir. q., aedil., flam. Romae et Aug., flam. divi Titi) is further defined as Aufidi Fortis p(atroni) c(oloniae) fil(ius). The dedication erected by 4 liberti, is paralleled by a twin dedication to his father (C14.4621), whose cursus includes the title patron ('[II]vir, q.aer.Ost.V, p(atronus) c(oloniae)').

The exemption of both from the patronate is, however, far less surprising than the remarkable case of the consul, M. Tineius Ovinus Castus Pulcher, son and grandson of patrons. The text, a dedication to him by the ordo at Tibur, merits citing in full - 'M. Tineio Ovinio L. f. Arn. Casto Pulchro, c.v., pont. maiori, q. urb., pr. K., cos., s.p.q. T., filio patroni, nepoti patronorum'. When one bears in mind the high profile of local senators as municipal patrons in all parts of the empire, and the extreme rarity in Africa of non-lacunary statue bases dedicated by the ordo to local (male) senators not named as patrons (see the list of 'non-patrons'), it can only be assumed that exemptions, such as that of Tineius, were seldom made. If exemptions occur in Italy, it may be tenable to suppose their existence also in Africa, as perhaps for the enigmatic Honoratianus.

Sufficient differences emerge between Italian and African patronal systems, however, to dissuade us from too confidently transposing the practices known from one region to the other. Prior to the fourth century (when Italy was, for administrative purposes, virtually indistinguishable from her *provinciae*), the most characteristic difference was the co-optation in Africa (as in other provinces) of non-local administrators. Even for local dignitaries however, extant epigraphy documents regional variation. In Africa, the supplanting of local office holders by citizens of equestrian and senatorial status appears to have been complete by the mid-second century⁷⁷. In Italy, where the proportion of patrons attested for the third century is significantly lower than Africa, it is apparent that the co-optation of local magistrates continued unabated into the later period⁷⁸. Italian communities, with a greater pool of candidates at their disposal, may accordingly have devised a more independent approach to the co-optation of children of existing patrons. Selection would obviously have its greatest effect upon those of sub-equestrian status, and it is to this group that virtually all the Italian children of patrons whose own co-optation is unconfirmed, belong, with only Tineius and the youthful (?) equestrian, L. Vibius Rutilus, as exceptions.

Decision on the ultimate patronal status of C. Valerius Gallia[n]us Honoratian[us, i.e., *patroni f[il(ius)]*], need not be determined by the obvious examples of exemption for patrons' children to hand in Italy. Alternatively, deferral of co-optation for patron's son, as exemplified by that for M. Cincius Felix Iulianus (B46) in Africa, provides some support for the view that Honoratianus' own patronate might have been scheduled for a later occasion, an anticipated benefaction, or entry upon manhood or a career. The former possibility might seem to be ruled out by the mention of the 'amor' which he, in company with his grandfather, father and brother, is said to have directed

⁷⁷ See p.322 for an apparent fourth century resurgence.

⁷⁸ The co-optation of local municipal *magistri* as patrons in Italy in the third century, appears from the catalogue of R. Duthoy ('Le profil social des patrons municipaux en Italie sous le Haut-Empire', *Ancient Society*, 15-17 (1984-6) pp.136-54) to have been maintained at a level similar to that of the preceding two centuries. Taking into consideration only those municipal dignitaries classified by Duthoy as rank 4.2 (as defined, *op. cit.*, p.127), 23 are undateable, 18 date between AD14 and 193, seven between AD 193-284 and six to the second or third century. Equal division of the latter group between the second and third centuries, producing a figure of 10 for the third century and 24 for the first and second centuries, thus clearly establishes that the co-optation of municipal dignitaries below the equestrian level remained approximately constant for all periods.

towards his patria. His youth, however, suggests that his is unlikely to have been a significant personal contribution, the more so, if the unspecified manifestation of 'amor', simultaneously involved all the family members mentioned. If the 'amor' jointly expressed by the Valerii refers to a recent and particularly conspicuous liberality by the family, all may be presumed to have received statues to mark the occasion, with only that to Honoratianus, the most junior participant, who was least actively involved, surviving. Joint dedications by communities to several members of prominent and generous family members, are frequent in Africa, as elsewhere. The occasion for the erection of Honoratianus' statue, may not, therefore, have marked any significant personal achievement at all. There is, thus, no obligation to construe the erection of a statue to Honoratianus as a secondary form of communal recognition, alternative to, and a substitute for, co-optation.

To this degree, the argument for deferral of Honoratianus' patronate until some preconceived point of time or anticipated event (but in any case probably whilst still *iuvenis*) remains valid. The problems with a deferral theory, however, remain serious. Firstly the African testimony for deferral relies on one text, and concerns a person who is sub-senatorial in status, and possibly, at the time of the text's erection, sub-*equestrian*. Co-optation occurred only in connection with considerable liberalities provided by the father, Cincius Victor. It may, therefore, be argued that the co-optation of patron's son below senatorial rank was far from being automatic, and was only achieved for Victor's son through the munificence mentioned. In Africa, patronal parents and children below senatorial rank are far less frequently found than in Italy. Excluding Mauretania, only three of the 12 examples of families with parents and children sharing the patronate are non-senatorial. All derive from the same confined area, two (mid-second century) from Thugga, the other (late third-fourth century) from neighbouring Uchi Maius⁷⁹. Again, excluding Mauretania, only one non-senator is found amongst the 12 children or youths attested as patrons, who are thereby

⁷⁹ The non-senatorial families are the Gabinii and Cincii from Thugga and the Mamii Vettii from Uchi Maius (n.1,2 and 7 on list (D)). The senatorial families are n.3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 14, 15 and 16 on list (D).

potentially the children of patrons⁸⁰. In Italy, non-senatorial families with parents and children as patrons approach parity with those who were senators (16 cf. 20)⁸¹. When one considers that the total of local non-senatorial patrons (from groups (B) and (C)) is appreciably higher than for senators - 90 compared to 81 (of whom only 69 are male) - the under-representation of non-senatorial patrons of the second generation is even more marked. It has already been argued (pp.109-14) that despite the higher total of local non-senatorial patrons, communities naturally enough chose to co-opt local senators once this became possible, and that this pattern was to the detriment of those beneath this status. The primary evidence for this is a comparison of complete statue bases erected to local senators, equestrians, 'sub-equestrians' and others by African communities which do not name the recipient as patron, totalling 5, 40, 27 and 74 respectively (males only).⁸² In combination with the low proportion of documented second generation local non-senatorial patrons, the far higher rejection rate of non-senators as patrons, which these honorific bases attest, argues for the existence of a selection process for the children of patrons, clearly favouring the descendants of senators. The albums of Timgad and Canusium also lend weight to this proposition. Both are dominated by senators (5 to 1 in Timgad⁸³, 31 to 8 in Canusium) and the

⁸⁰ The non-senatorial exception is Q. Latinius Primus Puniscus, II viralicus filius (B141). For the others, B83, 87, 88, 131, 132, 136, 138, 139, 140, 235 and C63 representing eight families, see list (C).

⁸¹ The non-senatorial families appear on list F without asterisks (n.5, 7, 10, 12, 14 and 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 26, 27, 30, 32, 34, 35) and include the Tannonii from list E (n.21). The senatorial families appear on list F with asterisks (n.1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 16, 18, 22 and 23, 24, 25, 28 and 29, 31 and 33) and include the Arrii, Claudii and Sallii from list E (n.12, 13 and 16). For children and youths attested as patrons, whose fathers were potentially patrons, the number of non-senators to senators is 6 (n.19,20,22,23,24, and 25 on list (E)) to 9 (n.5,6,7,8,9,14,15,17 and 18 on list (E)).

⁸² Senators - NB31,32,34,37,NC7. Equestrians - NB40-70, NC48, 10, 16, 17, 19, 20, 20A, 22. 'Sub-Equestrians' - NB71-73, 75-79, 81-86, 88-90, 92-101, 105. Others - NB106-110, 111, 112, 114, 117-120, 122-4, 126, 129-132, 134-39, 142-46, 148-56, 158-71, 173, 175-81, 183, 185-94, 196. Note that Honoratianus is one of the four senators not described as patron. The figures include both groups (B) and (C).

⁸³ In contrast to the evidence from statues, the album of Timgad indicates that the percentage of senators not co-opted at this time was as high as 50%. Of the 14 honorati who head the album, only six are patrons (5 clarissimi and a sacerdotalis), and the remainder comprise another 5 clarissimi, 2 perfectissimi and the other sacerdotalis. None of the 154 named members of the curia are described as patron, and this exclusion almost certainly also affected the 20 individuals whose names are lost in lacunae. It is clear, however, that statistics for non-co-optation drawn from the album cannot have had universal application even within the time frame of the C4. Besides the earlier evidence for the co-optation of equestrians and members of the decurial class, there are, for example, also C4 instances of local viri perfectissimi (B200) and flamines of sub-equestrian rank (B169, 170 and 199) known as patrons for Africa Proconsularis (and cf. the sub-equestrian decurion and dispunctor, patron of Auzia in Mauretania Caesariensis in 320 (B299)). The failure of half of the clarissimi on Timgad's album to appear as patrons is probably best explained by very recent acquisition of the laticlavus, with at least some of those named being the first of their family to occupy the rank (cf. A. Chastagnol, 'L'album municipal de Timgad', Bonn, 1978, p.25, for the ranking of Timgad's

latter contains at least eight senatorial patrons who are father and son (three fathers of five sons), whereas the eight non-senatorial patrons (all equestrian) furnish but one uncertain example of a father and son (the two T. Aelii).

A preponderance of the known children of local patrons, who are not themselves attested as patrons, are also sub-senatorial, but except for the daughter of Aurelius Dionysius (B148) discussed above, the nature of the texts prevents confirmation or denial of their co-optation⁸⁴.

Of the 22 patrons whose children are not named as patrons, only the children of seven (all sons) were senators. Apart from the father of Honoratianus, the patronal parents comprise four patronae (Aelia Celsinilla (B107), Iulia Avita Mamaea Augusta (B108), Furcilia Optata T[iberia]na (B110) and Seia Potitia Consortiana (B137)), and the patroni C. Vettius Sabinianus Iulius Hospes (B64-5) and P. Iulius Liberalis (B245). No significance need be attached to the unusually strong representation of patronae. The son of Mamaea (B108), the emperor Severus Alexander, in keeping with the practice of his imperial precursors, subsumed all such specific patronates within the authority of the imperial office itself, particularly in his capacity as pater patriae (cf. Engesser, pp.18-24, Harmand, pp.159-64, J. Nicols, 'Zur Verleihung', p.247). No comment is possible for the patrona Furcilia Optata T[iberia]na (B110), she and her son being known only from unpublished inscriptions. The sons of the remaining two patronae, the consular and curator, Agrius Celsinianus and the c.v., Roscius Potitus Memmianus are mentioned less for their own sake than to define and augment the status of their mothers. Celsinianus does appear on another African text (C25523), but the text is from another town (Bulla Regia), and Celsinianus again appears only to define and magnify the importance of the recipient - in this case his granddaughter Agria Tannonia.

'non-patron' clarissimi by the length of tenure of senatorial status). Note that one of the flamines on the album, Elius Iulianus, soon after acquired the status of honoratus (as praesidialis) and the title of patron (C266-7).

⁸⁴ See list (I).

The context of the inscriptions wherein the sons of the remaining two patrons are mentioned, is even less relevant to whether or not the sons were also patrons. Both texts derive from different communities to those where the fathers were patrons, and neither mentions their father's patronate at all. The patron of Thuburbo Maius, C. Vettius Sabinianus Iulius Hospes (B64-5) and his son C. Vettius Gratus Sabinianus are only mentioned to vaunt the senatorial lineage of C. Vettius Gratus Atticus Sabinianus, their grandson and son respectively, a patron of neighbouring municipium Aurellium C[ommodianum ? -] (C823 = B83). The sons of P. Iulius Liberalis, sacerdotalis p(rovinciae) A(fricae) and patron of Verecunda (B245) are referred to, unnamed, on an honorific fragmentary dedication to Liberalis, who is termed 'pater senator[um et avus cla]rissimor(um) puerorum' (AE(1980)955). Again, their inclusion is only made to expand the dignity of the recipient of the text.

One can scarcely conclude from any of the examples above, that the senatorial children concerned were not themselves patrons of the same community as their parents. They cannot be used to corroborate in any form, therefore, the view that Honoratianus' patronate was passed over rather than deferred. The ultimate fate of Honoratianus, and the prospects of other African senators whose fathers were patrons, cannot, regrettably, be predicted on the basis of current evidence. On the other hand, while it is clear that local senators were the preferred choice of patron, and that young senators with fathers as patrons were highly eligible for co-optation, there was nothing, save its own pragmatic self-interest, which bound a community to co-opt the son of a patron, senator or otherwise, despite the stipulations of the 'inheritance clause' of tabulae patronatus. While it is difficult to conceive the logic behind non co-optation of senators with fathers as patrons - at least for those not grossly deficient in character - an irrefutable case exists for Italy (see above). The Italian community concerned - Tibur - had it is true, numerous senators in residence or semi-residence from whom to select patrons. This, of course, was far from being the case for Uzappa, or for three other African towns of comparative size, Sufetula, Abbir Maius and Zattara, all of whom also elected to honour senators of local origin with statues, without apparently

ever having conferred upon them the patronate⁸⁵. Unlike Honoratianus, it is unknown whether their fathers had previously been co-opted, but their age - all were *viri not iuvenes*, as indicated by their title or most recent office (*c.v.*, *curator rei publicae*, *praetor* and *quaestor urb.* respectively) - suggests that entitlement to the patronate in their own right might have been expected.

One must it seems, entertain the prospect that local African senators whose fathers had attained the patronate could not in every case be assured of acquiring their father's title. The reasons for such exclusion are unlikely to ever be apparent to us, but both the known patterns of co-optation in Africa, and the relative scarcity of dedications to senators who are not named as patrons, indicate that exclusion was rarely countenanced.

Differentiation between young patrons of groups (B) and (C) in Africa is hampered in the first place by the relatively few examples from the latter group, and in the second, by the existence of close parallels between these and their peers in group (B). Both groups for instance comprise *puellae* as well as *pueri*, youths as well as children, and equestrians (or their sons) as well as senators. Again, the patronate of both groups can be shown to have been associated with that of their father in some cases, whilst evidence for non-association does not exist.

It will be observed from list (D), that in Africa, the most frequently occurring bond between patrons of the same family is that of parent and child, and more specifically, that of father and son. In Italy too, the inscriptions reveal the same preference for selecting patrons by linear descent through the male line. The passage of the patronate from father to son can also be anticipated from the existence of other patronal relationships, the most obvious being those of grandfather and grandson, and mother and son. There are besides several indeterminate patronal relationships, where the joint co-optation of father and son can be surmised, and it has already been argued that

⁸⁵ L. Caecilius Plautius Catullinus, *c.v.*, *curator rei publicae*, Sufetula (C11332); Sex. Asinius Rufinus Fabianus, M. fil. Hor., *sacerdos* [La]uren[tium], [q]uaestor ur[b]an. ab actis Senatus cos., *aedilis Cerealis*, *pr[ae]tor*, Abbir Maius (ILA 297) and Q. Domitius Hispanus, P.f.Q[u]ir., *trib. [mi]l.*, *leg XVI Flavia*. Firmae, *quaestor urb.*, Zattara (IL Alg 1536). See NC7, NB31, NB34. Later co-optation remains possible for the other senatorial 'non-patron', the *clarissimus puer*, C. Annius Armenius Donatus of Thamugadi (NB37).

the attestation of young patrons (below the age of 25) presupposes the anterior or co-eval co-optation of their father. Pivotal as the father/son connection so obviously was, the extension of the patronate was on occasions also passed from husband to wife or from father to daughter. Bulla Regia reveals a patronal nexus of considerable complexity, embracing not only wives and daughters but cousins and remoter collaterals, suggesting that all members of the family (the Aradii) received the patronate as an automatic entitlement. The co-optation of Aradia Ros[cia]-ne[-]e(?)[-] Calpurnia Purgilla, c.p., filia P. Aradi Rosci Rufini Saturn[i]ni Tiberiani, c.i. (B146), a girl no more than 10, and probably little older than five, indicates as much. No other patronal families from Africa exhibit anything like the ramifications of the Aradii, and such blanket concessions of the patronate to an entire family were, one suspects, rare. The exceptional case of the Aradii appears to have been a tribute to a particularly dynamic family, one of the most influential and prosperous in the fourth century, and one whose pre-eminence was evidently in formulation in the early third century, when epigraphy records seven family members (all senators) as patrons of Bulla Regia and the locale.

The succession of male patrons into the third generation and beyond, which may be deduced from the frequent occurrence of fathers and sons as patrons, is more clearly discernible in Italy than in Africa. The African evidence, while incomplete or tentative for the particular families concerned, is, in toto, sufficiently convincing to be certain of the regular (or at least common) prolongation of the patronate through the male line. The Caecilii, patrons of Thuburbo Minus and the vicinity (B56, 99 and C82 and cf. C48) appear to provide three generations of patrons in linear succession, but the current state of our information about the family admits only a tentative genealogy (cf. M. Corbier, *Tituli V* p.735). A presumption of lineal descent through three or more generations of patrons also exists for the Vettii, patrons of Thuburbo Maius and neighbouring municipium Aurellium C[ommodianum? -] (B64-5 and 83), where the relationship is that of grandfather and grandson, and for the Ennii (B33 and 125), Gabinii (B38,39,40,66 and 75) and Calpurnii (B57 and 69), where the exact

relationship of all members is unknown, but where the chronology allows for at least three generations. Finally, the phrase 'patronus a parentibus', found twice in Africa (B133-4 and B167-C168), which in itself may connote more than two generations, was indubitably also borne by the two individual's sons. The phrase recalls similar expressions from Italy, vaunting patronal ancestry. Thus Valerius Publicola is termed 'ab atavis patronus' (C9.1591), an anonymous patron of Saena 'a maioribus suis inlustribusq. familiis civitatis patronus' (C6.1793) and L. Mamilius Licinianus 'porro ab origine patronus' (C10.4755).

The proportion of local African patrons attested as sharing the patronate with at least one other member of their family is high, 37.43% (63/171)⁸⁶. The 63 patrons concerned may be grouped into 26 actual families, at least two of whom, the Aradii and Memmii of Bulla Regia, were also inter-related. Geographically, as anticipated from the distribution of group (B) and (C) patrons, the majority of these families derive overwhelmingly from Africa Proconsularis. To this province belong 22 families comprising 55 individuals, patrons of 13 communities⁸⁷. Numidia and

⁸⁶ 47 of the 63 are group (B) (B33, 38, 39, 40, 42, 45, 46, 55, 56, 57, 58, 69, 64-5, 66, 69, 75, 83, 87, 88, 91, 92, 96, 97-8, 99, 103, 104, 110, 113, 115, 117, 125, 133, 134, 137, 138, 139, 140, 146, 167, 169, 170, 188, 189, 222, 223-4, 268, 269): 16 of the 63 are group (C) (C48, 78, 79, 82, 105A, 106, 114, 149, 150, 151, 152, 168, 243, 244, 285, 286).

⁸⁷ The 22 families from Africa Proconsularis are arranged in list (D) according to relationship. In alphabetical order, with client and reference number to list (D), these are:

Accii	-	Utika - 16
Anicii	-	Uzappa - 4
Aradii	-	Bulla Regia (and vicinity) - 19 and 37 cf.14
Arrii	-	Avioccala - 15
Attii	-	Uchi Maius - 38
Aurelii	-	Madauros - 28
Baburii	-	Hippo Regius - 26
Caecilii	-	Thuburbo Minus (and vicinity) - 3 and 31
Calpurnii	-	Thugga - 32
Ceionii	-	Bulla Regia - 6
Cincii	-	Thugga - 2
Enji	-	Bisica Lucana - 29
Gabinii	-	Thugga - 1 and 34
Mamii Vettii	-	Uchi Maius - 7
Marcii	-	Thugga - 33
Memmii	-	Bulla Regia - 14 cf. 19 and 37
Memmii	-	Gigthis - 36
Munii	-	Avedda - 35
Octavii Volusii	-	Utika - 5
Pullaienii	-	Thugga - 30
Vettii	-	Thuburbo Maius (and vicinity) - 17
Apollodorus & brothers	-	Thuburbo Maius - 27

The 13 communities where 2 or more family members were patrons are, in alphabetical order, with patronal gens, reference number to list (D) and total of family members:

Avedda	Munii (35)	Total 2
--------	------------	---------

Mauretania are represented by only two families each; Numidia by the Geminii of Cirta (B222 and 223-4) and the Iulii Iuniani of Thamugadi (C243 and 244), Mauretania by king Iuba and his son Ptolemy in Caesarea (C268 and 269) and by the Gargilii of Auzia (C285 and 286). With the exception of Iuba and his son, patrons in approximately 20AD (and as regents, atypical), patronal families are not found prior to the early second century, the earliest instance being that of the Gabinii of Thugga (B38, 39 and 40) in 128-38. Local patrons are not, however, well attested for the years before 128. Africa Proconsularis documents only 11 (B1, 7, 13, 16, 17, 19, 22, 31, 32, 33 and 36) - all first century or earlier, Numidia none at all, and Mauretania none save Iuba and Ptolemy. The Italian evidence, for the first century, where epigraphical attestation of patrons is much more frequent, provides no example of the patronate passing from father to son, and only one of members of the one family sharing patronal responsibility. From Duthoy's list of patrons for the years 14-283 only two of the 48⁸⁸ dated between 14 and 96 share family ties, the consular brothers Cn. Domitius Afer Titius Marcellus Curvius Lucanus, Sex. f. Vol. and Cn. Domitius Curvius Tullus Sex. f., patrons of Fulginiae under Domitian⁸⁹. The recent addition of Cn. Pomponius Saturninus, Cn. f., patron of Saepinum (AE(1984)368), and ...

Avioccala	Arrii (15)	Total 2
Bisica Lucana	Ennii (29)	Total 2
Bulla Regia	Ceionii (6)	Total 2
Bulla Regia	Memmii (14 cf.19 and 37)	Total 2
Bulla Regia and vicinity	Aradii (19 and 37 cf. 14)	Total 7
Gigthis	Memmii (36)	Total 2
Hippo Regius	Baburii (26)	Total 2
Madauros	Aurelii (28)	Total 2
Thuburbo Maius	Apollodorus and brothers (27)	Total 3
Thuburbo Maius and vicinity	Vettii (17)	Total 2
Thuburbo Minus and vicinity	Caecilii (3 and 31)	Total 4
Thugga	Calpurnii (32)	Total 2
Thugga	Cincii (2)	Total 2
Thugga	Gabinii (1 and 34)	Total 5
Thugga	Marcii (33)	Total 2
Thugga	Pullaienii (30)	Total 2
Uchi Maius	Attii (38)	Total 2
Uchi Maius	Mamii Vettii (7)	Total 2
Utika	Accii (16)	Total 4
Utika	Octavii Volusii (5)	Total 2
Uzappa	Anicii (4)	Total 2

⁸⁸ The 48 include 46 dated I, II or I-II by Duthoy, n.287 redated by Duthoy to I (cf. n. 61 p.147), and C. Fufius Geminus of Tiberian date (cf. Duthoy, p.136 n.5).

⁸⁹ R. Duthoy, op. cit., p.142 n.143-4 (=C11.5210 and 5211, or D990 and 991).

M. Pacceius, M.f., patron of Ostia (AE (1985) 161)), both first century patrons, brings the total of patrons for the period 14-96 up to 50. Neither are connected to the other 48. Prior to Tiberius, 34 patrons of Italian communities are known - the figure does not include members of the imperial family - of whom only the Poppaei brothers at Interamna are related to one another. None are related to the 49 patrons above⁹⁰.

The 84 patrons from Italy datable to 96 or earlier (50 and 34), form but 21.76% of all 386 patrons anterior to Diocletian for whom some dating criteria either side of 96 may be attached. (A total of 386 is achieved by adding 344 patrons from Duthoy's list, 34 patrons datable prior to AD14 and an additional eight patrons not included by Duthoy⁹¹. This proportion, while still low, is slightly double that for Africa where

⁹⁰ The 34 patrons comprise:

- (1) A. Aemilius, A.f. (Setia) C10.8398
- (2) Q. Articuleius Regulus (Canusium) C9.331
- (3) C. Avilius Gavianus (Industria) C5.7478
- (4) Q. Caecilius Atticus (Tuder) C11.4652-3
- (5) C. Calvisius Sabinus (Gaudiano) C9.414
- (6) Q. Calvisius Sabinus, C.f. (Spoletium) C11.4772
- (7) Sex. Campatius, M.f., M.n. (Caere) C11.3610
- (8) Q. Ceppius Maximus (Paestum) EE VIII 288
- (9) Claudius, T[iff.] (Capua) C10.3848
- (10) Ti. C[laudius ?-] (Fundi) (C10.6231)
- (11) C. Clodius Vestalis, C.f. (Forum Clodii) D904
- (12) L. Cornelius Balbus (Capua) C10.3854
- (13) Fadenus Bassus, Q. f. Qui. (Nursia) AE (1950) 89
- (14) M. Herennius Picens, M.f. (Veii) C11.3797
- (15) M. Holconius Rufus, M.f. (Pompeii) C10.830
- (16) C. Iulius Caesar (Saticula) C9.2142, (Bovianum) C9.2563, (Luna) C11.1330, (Camerinum) C11.5628, (Alba Fucens) AE (1964)7, (Vibo Valentia) AE (1967) 107
- (17) C. Marcius Censorinus, L.f. (Aquinum) C10.5396
- (18) L. Munatius Plancus (Montefano) C9.5815-6.
- (19) L. Nonius Asprenas (Velia) C10.83426 (Falerio) C11.7493
- (20) M. Nonius Balbus, M.f. Men. (Herculaneum) AE (1976) 144.
- (21) Paullus Fabius Maximus (Hadria) D919.
- (22) Q. Pedius, M.f. (Casinum) AE (1971) 97.
- (23) [-Pla]ut[us] Sil[vanus] (Trebulae Suffenas) AE (1972) 162= (1985) 283.
- (24) A. Pompeius, A. f. Clu. (Interamna Nahars) C11-4213
- (25) Sex. Pompeius, Cn. f. (Abella) C10.1200.
- (26) Cn. Pompeius Magnus, Cn. f. (Auximum) C9.5837.
- (27) C. Poppaeus, Q.f. (Interamna) C9.5074-5
- (28) Q. Poppaeus, Q.f. (Interamna) C9.5074-5
- (29) C. Quinctius, C.f. Valg. (Aeclanum) C9.1140-1
- (30) Q. Sallustius, (Pompeii) C10.792, 958
- (31) P. Tettius Rufus Tontianus (Atina) C10.5060
- (32) M. Titius (Auximum) C9.5853
- (33) Q. Varius Geminus (Superaequum) C9.3305
- (34) L. Volusius Saturninus, Q.f. (Lucus Feroniae) AE(1978) 304.

⁹¹ 344 patrons (n.1-8, 10-14, 18-19, 21-3, 25-9, 31-3, 35-7, 39-41, 45-8, 52-5, 57-64, 66, 69, 72-5, 77-82, 85-9, 91-4, 97, 100-113, 115-21, 125-33, 135-52, 154-62, 165-71, 173, 175-80, 182-8, 190-6, 198-198 bis, 199-202, 204-6, 209, 211-13, 215, 217-28, 230-1, 235-6, 238-51, 254-7, 259-60, 262-4, 267-8, 272, 275-8, 280, 285-91, 293-8, 301-7, 309-10, 313-23, 325-6, 329-30, 332, 336, 338-40, 342-

13 patrons are datable to 96 or earlier, a mere 9.35% of the 139 datable local patrons prior to 283. Numerically, Italian patrons for the early period (ante 96) are greater than their African contemporaries by a ratio of over 6 to 1 (84 cf. 13).

Notwithstanding the low proportions relative to the pre-Diocletianic totals for both regions, it may still be deemed surprising that the early period, with 9.7 (84 and 13) patrons extant, can produce but one father and son pair, the anomalous Mauretanian regents Ptolemy and Iuba. In Italy, the succeeding period (96-283) produces some 17 pairs of fathers and sons, whilst in Africa 11 are known, besides a further three pairs of alternative parent and child patrons (mothers and sons, fathers and daughters, both parents and daughters)⁹². Only one of the Italian pairs is datable to the early part of the second century. Both father and son are senators and constituted one of Ostia's most illustrious and best documented families, the Egrilii. The co-optation of A. Egrilius Plarianus and his (adoptive) son M. Acilius Priscus A. Egrilius Plarianus was approximately co-eval with that of the Gabinii from Thugga.

5, 347, 349-50, 352-67, 369, 371-80, 383, 385, 389-91, 394-6, 398-400, 402-3, 406-8, 410-1, 414, 416, 423, 425, 429-31, 435, 443, 446-50, 453, 455-6, 459, 462-4, 468-9, 472-5, 482, 486, 488, 490, and the first 2 patrons added on p.136-7 n.5).

34 patrons (see note above)

8 patrons (n.1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 11 of list below : n.9 is excluded as a date either side of 96 cannot be established).

Supplementary patrons to R. Duthoy's list

- (1) Capertia Valeriana, Maximi fil. (Bellunum) AE(1976) 250
- (2) C. Iulius [-] (Tarracina) C10.6317
- (3) [M. Iuven]tius [Secun]dus Rixa [Postumius Pan]sa Valerianus [-] Severus (Brixia) C5.4335.
- (4) M. Pacceius, L.f. (Ostia) AE (1985) 161.
- (5) Cn. Pomponius Saturninus, Cn. f. (Saepinum) AE (1984) 368.
- (6) L. Publilius Probatas, M.f. (Nola) AE(1976)143=(1979)183
- (7) M. Ro [-]ius [-], M.f.Vel. (Pola) Insc. It. X,1, 568.
- (8) Q. Suetrius Pudens, Q.f.Q.n.Arn. (Terventum) Tituli V (1982) 185.
- (9) [-]rius C.f. (Eporedia) C56781
- (10) anon. (Alba Fucens) Ant. Class. 55 p.68 n.16
- (11) anon (Ostia) C14.5331
- (12) anon. (Privernum) C6.1578
- (13) anon. (Tridentum) AE (1977) 283
- (14) anon (Uria) AE (1983) 287
- (15) anon. (inter Arce et Fontana) C10.5670
- (16) anon. (Picenum Firmum) C6.30556

N.B. (1) Only 9 of the above can be dated with any certainty -

- (1) C2, (2) C2, (3) mid-end C2, (4) mid-end C1 (50-70?),
 (5) beg-mid C1, (6) c mid C3, (8) end C2, (9) C1 -C2, (11) 198-211.

N.B. (2) Note a further 7 patrons (or potential patrons) from lacunary texts.

- (1) C14.2900 (Praeneste), (2) C11.1439 (Pisa), (3) C11.6235 (Fanum Fortunae), (4) C11.6339 (Pisaurum),
 (5) C6.1491 (? , Italia?), (6) C6.3278 (? , Italia), (7) C6.37095 ([Jenses, Italia?).

⁹² See list (1) n.14,15,16.

The Italian and African epigraphic records so closely parallel one another in the chronological distribution of patronal families, that one is forced to conclude that extension of the patronate to a patron's son and other family members only became accepted practice from the early second century. In rejecting a policy of securing the male line during the earlier period, the communities may have been responding to a fear that automatic renewal of the patronate from one generation to the next would dissipate both the esteem of the title and the beneficia the community anticipated from its conferral. If so, reversal of this policy was probably effected gradually and unevenly, with the major beneficiaries being persons of the senatorial class. Even as late as the third century, as has been seen in Italy and (perhaps) Africa, the patronate might be withheld from senators whose fathers had been patrons. By the fourth century, however, the widespread adoption of the terms 'patronus originalis', 'ab origine patronus' etc. - particularly in Italy, where the bearers include municipal dignitaries and equestrians, as well as senators - signalled that a considerable further diminution of civic independence had taken place.

GROUP (C) - APPENDIX - VIBIA AURELIA SABINA

Vibia's biography is perforce sketchy,¹ but what can be deduced from the occasional epigraphic mention, suggests that she resided chiefly in Rome, not moving to Africa until the middle or end of Severus' reign. A statue erected to her at Rome by her freedman Heliodorus (C6.1020) describes her as d(ivi) Marci Aug. f., and is, therefore, datable to the reign of Commodus, and very probably prior to 189-90, whilst her husband was still alive. Vibia was presumably still in Rome at the time of Burrus' alleged conspiracy and execution. Her name occurs again on a Roman inscription (a lead pipe - C15.7402 cf. 7401) but with the appellation Augusti soror, and in association with L. Aurelius Agaclytus, to be identified with an eques Romanus of the same name from a Roman epitaph (C6.1592). Agaclytus is evidently Vibia's

¹ cf. H. G. Pflaum, 'Les gendres de Marc - Aurele', *Journal des Savants*, (1961) pp38-9 and G. Barbieri, 'Ostia, fistole acquare inedita o completate', *N.S.* (1953) p.157.

second husband, and the son of a homonymous freedman, a favourite of the emperor Verus, whom Verus had espoused to the widow of Marcus Aurelius' cousin M. Annius Libo. The title Augusti soror, Severan rather than Commodan², appears again in the name of Vibia's freedman at Suessa, south of Rome, where Vibia may have owned praedia (C10.4763)³.

The death of Agaclytus in Rome (cf. C6.1592) may have prompted Vibia to retire to the estates of her first husband in Numidia. The execution of her sister Fadilla's husband, M. Peducaeus Plautius Quintillus, in 205, may also have suggested the wisdom of distancing herself from the imperial court. Vibia's only other surviving sister, Cornificia, may well have envied her a pretext for leaving, having also endured the execution of her husband at the order of Commodus, and remarriage to a man far beneath her station⁴. The earliest attestation of Vibia's presence in Africa, is of uncertain Severan dating - Vibia bears the appellation imp. Severi Aug. n. soror - and is from Calama (ILAlg I242). The dedication to her is by a client, C. Annius Saturninus, presumably connected to an important local family, one of whom, Annia Aelia Restituta, a flaminica, expended 400,000 sesterces on a theatre at perhaps this time (161-9 or 198-210, cf. ILAlg I286-7). The two remaining African texts which refer to Vibia - those describing her as a patron of Thibilis and Calama - postdate Severus (211-12 and post 211 (211-17?) respectively). Nothing is known of her thereafter. There may be a connection with the suicide of her sister Cornificia in 212

² There are no certain examples of this appellation being employed by either Vibia or her sister Cornificia under Commodus, whereas its usage thereafter is attested by ILAlgII 4661, ILAlgI 241, 242, and C15.7402 for Vibia and by AE(1954)171 for Cornificia. Even more germane to the argument is the absence of this phrase in two texts which are clearly Commodan, to describe Vibia viz. C6.1020, where she is d(ivi) Marci Aug. f. and Eleusinius *Ἐφεσίου ἀρχαίου* (1894) p.212 n.38, where she is similarly divi Antonini filia (cf. PIR, V411). The omission of the phrase Augusti soror surely came at Commodus' behest, possibly as a reaction to Lucilla's plot early in the reign (182).

³ Note an epitaph erected to two slaves at Puteoli (IG14.846) by a certain Aurelia Vibia Sabina. If this is the same person, and not a near-homonym, the absence of any imperial titles probably owes to the informal nature of the text, rather than to a hypothetical proscription on the use of imperial filiation by her brother, following Burrus' downfall. Alternatively, Aurelia Vibia Sabina may be the freedwoman of Marcus' daughter (or a descendant) whose nomina were reversed to distinguish her from her patrona.

⁴ Cornificia's remarriage to an equestrian, the procurator Didius Marinus, is also known from the association of both names on lead pipe (AE (1954)171, from Ostia, rather than Rome). Of Vibia's three other sisters, the eldest, Annia Galeria Aurelia Faustina, died before Commodus' reign; Lucilla was first exiled and then executed during Commodus' reign; and Fadilla, who survived the reign, vanishes from sight.

at the behest of Caracalla (Dio Cassius LXXVII, 16, 6a, Herodian IV, 6,3). Vibia would have been approximately 42 at this date.

Sources for Vibia Aurelia Sabina	Date
1) literary : Philostratus, vitae soph. II, 1,11	c174
2) epigraphic : Rome : C6.1020, C15.7402, (cf.7401)	180-92 and 193-211
Suessa, Italia : C10.4763	193-211
?Puteoli, Italia: IG14. 846	?
Villaviciosa, Lusitania: C2.133	post 170
Eleusis, Achaea: Eleusinius, Ἐφεμ. ἀρχαιολ. (1894) 212n.38	180-92
?Ephesus, Asia : CIG2964	?
?Belalis Maior, Africa Proconsularis: AE (1978)841	166
Calama, Numidia Proconsularis: ILAlgI241	193-211
Calama, Numidia Proconsularis: ILAlgI242	211-17
Thibilis, Numidia ILAlgII4661	211-12

Members of Vibia's familia

Hermes Aureliae Vibiae Sabinae ser. marmorarius	-C2.133
Mocimus Sabinae Augusti sororis lib. tabul.	-C10.4763
Heliodorus lib. et proc. p(ortus)u(triusque)	-C6.1020
& cf. L. Septimius Vibius Trophimas Augg. lib.	-C2.26261
& Aurelius Olympus	-ILAlgII6002
& Vibia Vitalis	"
& Aurelia Vibia Sabina	IG14.846
& Callityche (slave of above)	"
& Gelasis (slave of above)	"

Chapter VIII Group (D) Patrons

Group (D) is less a group than a repository of remainders, whose assignation to groups (A) (B) or (C) is not deemed possible, either - as in the majority of cases (12/16) - as a result of critical textual lacunae, or because the patrons concerned were neither Africans, nor administrators in Africa¹.

The former group may be further subdivided according to the state of the information gap. This is most acute for five individuals for whom neither name, origin nor status is known². Notwithstanding these deficiencies, the context - so far as it can be construed - allows in two instances for the possibility that the anonymous patron was an administrator in Africa. The strongest case for assignation to group (A) concerns the anonymous patron of Thamugadi (D214), who under the reign of Pius appears to have dedicated a construction or statue to the emperor. Such dedications were frequently - though not always - made in Numidia by the current legate of the third Augustan legion. Numerous examples of these legates as patrons of Thamugadi can be cited, whilst on the other hand, patrons of local or at least Numidian origin do not occur prior to the reign of Severus Alexander in Thamugadi, and outside the Cirtan confederacy (and satellites), do not occur in Numidia until the advent of Septimius Severus³. The presumption that the anonymous patron of Lemellef in Mauretania (D294) may have been an administrator of the province depends on his description on an honorific dedication by the ordo as 'patronus praestantis(simus)', a term applied in Africa only to administrators. All the examples (A182a,195,198) derive, however, from distant Tripolitana, and there is no cogent reason why the phrase should be

¹ Patrons assigned to group (D) because of critical textual deficiencies are D37,71,191,197,214,252,279,280,281,291,292,294. The remainder (non-Africans holding no administrative position in Africa) are [-] Uttiedius After (D2), P. Fabius Firmanus (D13A), [-] Valerius Naso (D270) and Q. Iulius Secundus (D271), for whom see pp. 212-16 below.

² D37,214,279,291,294.

³ The earliest known local patron of Thamugadi is P. Fl(avius) Pudens Pomponianus (signo) Vocontius (B241, AD222-35); of Numidia (excluding the Cirtan confederation), C. Iulius Rufinus Laberius Fabianus Pomponius Triarius Erucius Clarus Sosius Priscus, patron of Diana Veteranorum (B235), and whose exact origins are in fact questionable. (Relatives, the Sosii Prisci were, however, in some way connected with the Cirtan confederacy, cf. M. LeGlay, *Tituli V* (1982) p.775).

restricted to administrators (see pp.278-9 n.7). All the three remaining texts (D37,279 and 291) comprise fragmentary *tabulae patronatus*, and furnish no clues as to the character of the patron co-opted. There are too many examples of patrons of doubtful status recorded on African *tabulae*, for instance, to sustain Nicols' contention that these contracts were only reserved for administrators⁴.

A second subdivision of four patrons provides some indication as to their status, but none as to their name or origin (D71,197,252,292). They include a patron of Lepcis Magna whose fragmentary *cursus* reads '[tri]buno [-leg.] III Gem(inae)', possibly a proconsul of Africa (D71); two (or more)[cl]arissimi [viri] from Madauros, on a particularly mutilated text (D197); a (possible) praefectu[s-] from Cirta, who may with equal probability be senator, equestrian or local dignitary (D252)⁵; and finally a patron of Mopth [-] in Mauretania, whose status is even more unclear, all that exists of his *cursus* being '[-] Aug.', but possibly a procurator of the province (D292). The latter is clearly dedicand of a construction (the letter height is monumental -29 cm.), but it is impossible to determine whether this is being performed in his capacity as procurator, or as a private benefactor.

The final subdivision comprises three patrons whose names are known or partly known, and whose senatorial rank is either known, as for M. Ael[ius-] Candidia[nus], c.v., pro[-] consularis, patron of Sufetula (D191); or can be assumed on the strength of their names, as is manifest for two patrons of Banasa in Tingitana, P. (Cornelius) Lentulus Sci[pio] and L. Labienus [-], L.f. Pol. (D280 and 281). The Sufetulan text is late (probably post 293), and may concern a consular of Byzacena, reading with P.L.R.E. p.179, 'pro[vinciae Byzacenae con]sulari', although as C. Lepelley remarks ('Les cités', II p.31 n.15), this construction is 'assez fragile'. The motivation for the erection of a statue to Candidianus by the *ordo* is partly specified - '[ob insignem a]morem in [cives-]'. Expressions of this type are employed alike for

⁴ J. Nicols, 'Tabulae Patronatus, A Study, of the Agreement between Patron and Client - community', ANRW, 11,13,1980 p.545 (and see above pp.17-19).

⁵ In fact, it is uncertain whether the fragment bearing the single word '[-] praefectu[s]' belongs to the text. The conjecture is Cherbonneau's (cf. ILAlgII707).

administrators, as for local citizens⁶, but are far more frequently found for the latter. For the two senatorial patrons of Banasa, both of whom may be assigned to a date anterior to 162, Italian origin seems certain for one, P. (Cornelius) Lentulus Sci[pio], descendant or the same as the two homonymous consuls of 24 and 56, and probable for the other, L. Labienus[-], L.f.Pol., descendant, perhaps, of T. Labienus, the 'orator magnus' under Claudius⁷. No construction need be placed on the fact that both the texts to Scipio and Labienus are tabulae patronatus (see above), nor even on the existence of two other tabulae from Banasa to administrators (A272, and 275). The tabulae for Sex. Sentius Caecilianus, Sex. f. Quir., leg. Aug. pro pr. ordinandae utriusque Mauretaniae, cos. desig. from both Banasa (A272) and Volubilis (A272a), certainly provide a precedent for co-opting a senatorial governor of Tingitana. However, it is evident from Sentius' title that the post was a specific mission, similar to that undertaken in Africa with the consul Rutilius Gallicus, where extensive boundary demarcations were established⁸. The administration of Tingitana by senators was an abnormal occurrence engendered for the purpose of provincial re-organisation in the case of Sentius, and for reasons unknown, but probably to be connected to the accomplishment of a particular administrative task, in the case of Uttedius Honoratus, c.v. praeses in 144, and the only other known senatorial governor of the province. Between the formation of the province in AD40 and the terminus ante quem of our two tabulae, 162, 15 of the 17 documented governors of Tingitana were procurators, sometimes styled pro legato, and their experience and capability seems generally to have contained the frequent flare ups to which the province was prone. The procuratorial system appears on these statistics to have worked relatively

⁶ cf. p.286n.20 and p.287 n.23.

⁷ A date anterior to 162 is certain, from the absence of Aurelia in the name of Banasa (cf. IAM 128 adn. and AE (1954) 259 adn.) Compare J. Nicols, loc. cit., for the view that Cornelius and Labienus may have been senatorial governors. M. Euzennat, 'Fragments inédits de bronzes épigraphiques marocains', *Ant. Af.*, 3, 1969, p.132, makes no comment on their status in his list of tabulae patronatus from Mauretania Tingitana. Labienus is thus described by PIR, L18 - 'Homo nobilis certe fuit'. The only other Labienus in PIR earlier than 162, the orator T. Labienus (L19) would seem, from the infrequency of the nomen, to be an ancestor. IAM 129 adn. notes that the last known bearer of the 2 cognomina Lentulus and Scipio was the consul of 24.

⁸ For debate as to whether Sentius' role in Tingitana was primarily military in nature or administrative, cf. IAM4315 adn., M. Benabou, 'La résistance africaine à la romanisation', Paris, 1976, p.93 and 103; M. Euzennat, 'Jérôme Carcopino et le Maroc', *Hommage à J. Carcopino*, Paris, 1977, p.85.

smoothly, and imperial tampering to have been very intermittent. In this state of affairs, Tingitana's administration is unlikely to have admitted more than a handful of senators into its ranks, and there can be no confidence that Scipio and Labienus were such.

An alternative solution is that both were large land owners in or around Banasa, or had business interests there. Connections with Banasa may have been established by themselves or their maiores even anterior to the formation of Tingitana as a province. Banasa was a deduction of veterans created by Augustus sometime between 33 and 25 BC, and had therefore been in existence over 50 years at the time of the consulate of P. Cornelius Lentulus Scipio, homonymous ancestor, or identical to, one of the two patrons. The consul of 24 is also known to have commanded the legion VIII Hispania in Africa, veterans of which may have retired in Banasa, and wished to be represented in the heart of the empire by their former commander. If the first draft of colonists were primarily Italians, Banasa's proximity to Spain assuredly soon enticed Spanish veterans to settle, and this settlement is likely to have been realised long before our first datable epigraphic record in the early second century.⁹ Banasa, like Tingis, another Iulian colony, was, moreover, probably administratively connected to Baetica prior to AD40¹⁰, a factor - together with trade - in ensuring some regularity in sea communication between the colonists and the Spanish mainland.

The possibility that Scipio and Labienus were not provincial governors, but absentee landlords or former commanders of veteran settlers during the vulnerable early stages of colonial settlement gains some credence from similar group (D) examples in three other African colonies, also datable to the early empire. The earliest - and the second earliest African patron on record - dates from the first years of the foundation of the Iulian colony of Carthage, between 43 and 33 BC. No connection between the patron - [-] Uttiedius Afer, L.f. augur, cos. desig. (D2) - and Carthage can be confirmed. An

⁹ For a Spanish veteran (Flavius from Virouesca) at Banasa cf. C16.166 cited by J.-M. Lassère, 'Ubique Populus', p.289, and note Valeria Messa, also Spanish, and married to a Syrian veteran at Banasa in 122 (C.16.169, cited by J.-M. Lassère, *op. cit.*, p.465 and n.80).

¹⁰ For the probability that Tingi and Zulil to the north were administratively attached to Baetica, see I.A.M. p.17

administrative function in the capital or province seems ruled out, however, for such a rôle would surely have been singled out for mention by the Carthaginienses who erected the dedication to him. African origin is also out of the question - over a century elapsed before an African (Q. Aurelius Pactumeius Fronto) revelled in the title 'cos. ex Africa primus' (ILAlgII644). Afer may, on the other hand, have owned property or had extensive interests in the new colony of Carthage, when acquisition of land was at a premium. His principle residence was not, however, Carthage itself, but near Rome, at Tibur, where the dedication to him was erected.

Two other group (D) patrons of Iulian colonies had as their clients Rusguniae and Tubusuctu, both, like Banasa, in Rome's 'wild west', Mauretania. The origin of the patronate of [-] Valerius Naso, (P. ? f.] Pub. (D270) appears to parallel that of Afer's. Naso's cursus makes it certain that his co-optation owed nothing to an administrative function in Mauretania. His origins and principal place of residence were indubitably at Verona, where a dedication to him by the plebs describes him as 'flam(en) Aug(ustalis) primus Veron(ae) creatus' (C5.3341). A homonym, taken by Alföldy and Syme to be his father, likewise held municipal posts in Verona, as IIII vir. aed. pot. and IIII vir i.d. (Not. Sc. 1893 p.7n.7)¹¹. His connection with Rusguniae, where a statue base erected by the Rusgunienses in 26 attests his patronate, appears, therefore, to have most likely derived from property or commercial interests acquired there. The preferability of the latter alternative is suggested by the primacy of Rusguniae's function as a commercial port, its hinterland being, in the words of J.-M. Lassère ('Ubique Populus', Paris, 1977, p.277), 'médiocrement riche'. The original connection between Verona and Rusguniae may have owed to Veronese veterans of legio VII Gemellae settling there at the colony's deduction, and/or to later drafts of veteran settlers from Verona. Veronese veterans settled in Rusguniae (or their descendants) may in turn have provided Naso with helpful information relating to the port's viability as an entrepôt, and have acted as reliable

¹¹ cf. G.Alföldy, *Tituli V* p.341, for the identification of Naso with the anonymous patron of Rusguniae, and for Naso's presumed father.

agents in his business ventures there. Their connection with Naso had never been one of soldier and commander, for Naso's career was purely administrative.

Such a bond between veterans in an African colony and their patron, has, however, been mooted by Pallu de Lessert and L. Harmand for the remaining group (D) patron in Mauretania, Q. Iulius Secundus, Q. f. Qui., patron of Tubusuctu in 55 (D271)¹². His patronate is recorded on a bronze tabula allegedly found, not in Tubusuctu, but near Cirta in Numidia, some 250 km. to the south-east. (This, at least, was apparently given as the plaque's find spot by the Arab vendor at Bône to its purchaser, the Spaniard Franciscus Escudero y Taltavull in 1821)¹³. Dessau (D6103) will have none of it, and his view that the plaque was discovered at Tubusuctu itself - 'Hippone Regio Africae empta ab Hispano quodam, reperta sine dubio Tubusuctu' - has, at least, the merit of disentangling one of the complexities behind the enigmatic patronate of Secundus. Secundus bears only one post on the text, that of *legatus pro praetore*. In which province Secundus exercised this command has been a matter of contention. Dessau, in company with the editors of CIL VIII (n.8837) and PIR (I560), places his command in Baetica. Mommsen and Willems, followed by Warmington, prefer Numidia¹⁴. Both choices are determined by the relative proximity of the provinces to Tubusuctu, with that of Numidia providing also an explanation for the purported discovery of the tabula near Numidian Cirta. The initial establishment of contact with Tubusuctu, 30 km. from the sea, some 250 km. from Cirta, and treble that to the nearest Baetican port, remains, however, difficult to conceive in either case. Moreover, neither the legates of Baetica nor those of Numidia enjoyed authority in Mauretanian territory, in normal circumstances. The failure of the text to indicate the province where Secundus acted as legate may indicate that his command was local, i.e. in Mauretania¹⁵. His choice as patron in these circumstances would be totally

¹² cf. L. Harmand, 'Le Patronat', p.217 n.130, citing Pallu de Lessert.

¹³ cf. addenda to C 8873 and D6103 and L. Harmand, *ib.*

¹⁴ Mommsen and Willems, *Ephemeris Epigraphica* II p.148. B.H. Warmington, 'Municipal Patrons', p.45 n.227.

¹⁵ Such omissions are commonplace, for example, in texts where legates in Numidia appear, but in virtually every instance the context establishes that the legate is acting officially in the province.

explicable by his office, but Mauretania Caesariensis provides only one certain instance of a senatorial governor, and that in exceptional circumstances, (the leg. pr. pr. utriusque Mauretaniae, Sex. Sentius Caecilianus, discussed earlier). The text to Secundus invites comparison with that to the wife of C. Iulius Commodus Orfitianus, patron of Simitthu (B51), whose only given post is leg. Aug. pro praetore. Rather than legate of neighbouring Numidia, or entrusted with a special command in Africa Proconsularis, Orfitianus seems in fact to have been legate in Thrace, a post known for him from a dedication erected there (AE (1951)227). The point is cogently argued by E. Birley,¹⁶ and if correct, provides some support for the view espoused by Pallu de Lessert and L. Harmand, which places Secundus' legateship neither in Mauretania, nor a neighbouring province, but in distant Dalmatia¹⁷. The connection with Dalmatia is based on the tabula's description of Tubusuctu as 'colonia Iulia Aug. legionis VII Tubusuctu', and the fact that the seventh Claudian legion is known to have been stationed in Dalmatia at the date the tabula was inscribed (55)¹⁸. Harmand provides a first century parallel to this from Deultum in Thrace, where the colonists actually specify that their co-optation of [-Avi]dus Quietus, leg. Aug. in 84 eventuated soon after their discharge from leg.VIII Aug., and deduction to Deultum¹⁹. In like manner, Pallu de Lessert imagines that fresh contingents of veteran settlers in Tubusuctu, with recent service in legio VII Claudia under Secundus, elected to honour their former commander. The theory has been found attractive not only by Harmand, but also by Engesser (n.232 p.101), who believes that Secundus was legate of Numidia at the time of his co-optation, an unnecessary embroidery, presumably based on the alleged Numidian find spot of the tabula. If Secundus was a former legate of the seventh Claudian legion, it may have seemed redundant to the colony which bore the legion's

¹⁶ E. Birley, 'Rezension zu Thomasson, Die Statthalter der römischen Provinzen Nordafrikas', JRS, 52 (1962) p.226.

¹⁷ See n. 12 above.

¹⁸ Tubusuctu is elsewhere described as 'col. Iul. Aug. Tubusuctitanae leg. VII immun.' (AE 1967) 641). Two neighbouring communities, Saldæ and Rusazu, bear the name of the same legion in their full titulature (Saldæ C8931, 8933, 20683; Rusazu BACTH (1919) p.175 cf. J.-M. Lassère, 'Ubique Populus', p.202, n.283).

¹⁹ L. Harmand, 'Le Patronat', pp.307-8. For the text, see C6.3828 = 31692 = D6105.

name to mention the fact. One would expect, however, from a colony of veterans the correct designation for their commander, viz. *legatus Aug. pro praetore*, and not the title borne by administrative legates, *legatus pro praetore*. The omission of the qualifying 'Aug(usti)' is extremely rare. The CILVIII indices provide only one instance of such an abbreviation for a Numidian legate, a brief official notice erected by the legate 'ex auctoritate imp'. (C10667). The only attested legate of Mauretania Caesariensis, Sex. Sentius Caecilianus, also appears once without the designation 'Aug.', not in either of the two Mauretanian tabulae on which he appears, but in an Italian dedication (C9.4194), which compresses all of the titles in his long *cursus*. The omission of 'Aug.' on the tabula to Secundus cannot be explained, however, either on the grounds of the text's brevity, or from a desire to compress his titles, the tabula being of standard size and remarkably free from abbreviations. A military command for Secundus in Numidia, Mauretania, Dalmatia, or elsewhere, is therefore difficult to entertain.

If a military legateship is precluded, there seems little justification in assuming that as administrative legate, Secundus would have served in either of the two closest provinces, Baetica (as D6103, C8837, PIR,I560 - see above) or Africa Proconsularis (as Y. Burnand, *Tituli Vp.429*), the distances from Tubusuctu still being considerable. Wherever Secundus acted as legate it thus seems unlikely that his co-optation was in any way directly connected to the office. Other connections with the client must, therefore, be sought. Secundus' origins cannot be established. No confidence can be placed in proposed ties with the Gallic orator and comes of Otho, Iulius Secundus, the nomenclature, as Burnand rightly comments, being too widespread throughout the empire (*Tituli V p.429*).²⁰ The rise of a descendant of Tubusuctu's veterans to senatorial status also seems unlikely at this early date, but cannot be ruled out. Secundus' co-optation would, in this case, exactly parallel that of the legate Orfitianus, patron and probably citizen of Simitthu (see above). The most probable scenario is

²⁰ For the view that Secundus may have had links with the Gallic orator Iulius Secundus, see R. Syme, 'Tacitus', *IA* pp. 911 and II p.800 n.1., and PIR,I560.

however, that surmised for some other group (D) patrons discussed, namely the possession of property or business interests in the client town²¹. The original formation of contact with the colony may have derived through fellow citizens of Secundus (possibly even relatives), who retired in Tubusuctu, but kept in communication with their original patria. Alternatively, Secundus may have married into a family descended from Tubusuctu's veterans.

Finally, we may turn to the only group (D) patron upon whom attention has not yet focused, P.[Fa]bius Firmanus, L.f.Q., leg., cos., whose patronate of Furnos Maius in the early-mid first century (43) has only just come to light (D13A)²². Both the nomen and date of the patron are secured by the appearance of a P. Fabius Firmianus (sic), cos. on a Pompeian tabula cerata (AE (1973) 162). Again, the context provides no clue as to whether Fabius was legate in Africa or elsewhere, nor even - most unusually - whether Fabius was legate of a proconsul, a province, or a legion. The laconic style of the text thus precludes us from determining whether Fabius may be regarded as a group (A) patron. If Fabius was legate outside of Africa, the link between himself and his client may have been established by the acquisition of praedia in the area. Both the remoteness and unimportance of the civitas of Furnos Maius²³ suggest that even if Fabius were legate in Africa Proconsularis, his patronate of this community was predicated primarily on his rôle as dominus of large tracts of local land. The sheer number of Africa's communities must have militated against the success of most in attaining the patronate of the province's most senior administrators, the proconsul and his legates. Inevitably, most small communities elected to co-opt less important officials (e.g. the military tribune C. Silius Aviola (A9-9c) and the

²¹ The area principally supported olives (cf. J.-M. Lassère, *Ubique Populus*, p.222 and p.302 and n.76 for second century amphoras from Tubusuctu, with the legend 'ex prov. Maur. Ces. Tubus.').

²² For the date of the consulship, see U. Vogel - Weidemann, *Die Statthalter von Africa und Asia in den Jahren: 14-68 n. Chr.*, Bonn, 1982, pp.151-2.

²³ Furnos Maius lies near the source of the Miliana, some 40 km. south-west of Thuburbo Maius. The community did not attain the status of municipium until the second century, the founder being either Trajan, Marcus or Commodus. The earliest attestation of municipal status is 183-5 (cf. J. Gascou, *'La politique municipale de l'Empire Romain en Afrique Proconsulaire de Trajan à Septime - Sévère'*, Rome, 1972 p.201; H.G. Pflaum, *'Afrique Romaine'*, 1978, Paris p.321; N. Ferchiou, *'Quelques inédits de Furnos Maius (Afrique proconsulaire) nouvelles données sur l'évolution juridique de cette ville'*, *L'Africa Romana*, Atti del II convegno di studio Sassari, 14-16 dicembre 1984, ed. Attilio Mastino, 1985 pp.179-88).

praefectus fabrum Q. Aufustius Macrinus (A24)) or sought suitable candidates either from their own citizenry or from the capital.

Analysis of the civic status of the documented clients of Africa's proconsuls and legates indicates that their co-optation by communities below the status of municipium was rare, and that other factors - in particular their ownership of land - were almost certainly involved. 33 of Africa's proconsuls, and 8 proconsular legates (excluding Fabius) of non-local origin, are found as patrons of 18 African communities.²⁴ All but 3 of these individuals - all proconsuls - had as their clients either communities designated as municipia or coloniae, or the important city Lepcis Magna, variously oppidum liberum, municipium and colonia.

The first of the exceptions, the jurist L. Octavius Cornelius P. Salvius Iulianus Aemilianus, P.f., proconsul in 167-8, and patron of Pupput (A60), almost certainly possessed land in the vicinity himself or was closely related to local landowners.

Promoted to colonial status by Commodus, Pupput's exact civic status at the time of Salvius' patronate is unknown - it may indeed have attained the dignity of municipium²⁵. Pupput lies some 80 km. to the north of Hadrumetum, a city of great prosperity from Phoenician times, a colony under Trajan, and the future capital of Byzacena. Hadrumetum was also reputedly the home of Aemilia Clara, niece or sister of Salvius. Salvius' own origin may or may not have been Hadrumetine - T.D. Barnes, for example, presents a strong case for Brixia as patria²⁶ - but Aemilia Clara was, at the least, closely associated with Hadrumetum, and presumably among the foremost landowners there and in the surrounding region, including perhaps Pupput²⁷.

²⁴ proconsuls - A4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14-14a, 18, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27-27a, 29, 30, 34, 35, 43, 44, 49, 50, 52, 60, 61, 67, 89A, 120, 156, 163, 175, 177, 180, 201. 8 legates of proconsuls - A12, 15, 28, 53, 54, 121, 122, 166.

²⁵ cf. J. Gascou, op. cit., pp.166-7. Although opting for a Hadrumetine origin for Salvius, Gascou, prefers not to see a direct link between this and his patronate of Pupput, attributing the co-optation purely to his tenure of the proconsulate.

²⁶ T.D. Barnes, 'A Senator from Hadrumetum and Three Others', *Bonner Historia - Augusta Colloquium* (1968-9), p.51.

²⁷ The Hadrumetine origin of Aemilia Clara is given by only one source, the *Historia Augusta* (Did. Iul. 1,2). Despite confusion over the exact relationships of the persons mentioned in the passage, there seems no reason to doubt the authenticity of the link with Hadrumetum. Salvius' own Hadrumetine origins have most recently been voiced by I.Piso & P.Rogczea, 'Ein Apollo heiligtum in der Nähe von Tibiscum,' *ZPE*, 58 (1985) p.212. Mme. Corbier, with more justification, assigns Salvius a Hadrumetine origin, but attaches a

Aemilia Clara could also, of course, guarantee reliable oversight of any property Salvius cared himself to acquire in Pupput, whose hinterland then, as now, was impressively fertile.

The small community of Gurza attests two patrons, both of the early empire, but differing greatly in status, the praefectus fabrum, Q. Aufustius Macrinus in AD65 (A24), and the second exceptional proconsul, L. Domitius Ahenobarbus in 12 BC (A4). The latter is known as the proprietor of large estates, the saltus Domitianus, in the fertile grain belt of the Bagradas valley, near Thugga. The early years of Augustus' reign were evidently an optimum time to purchase ranch-size portions of prime agricultural real estate²⁸. Ahenobarbus, a by-word for arrogance and for an ostentatious liberality, vulgar even by Roman standards²⁹, is unlikely to have limited his acquisition to one holding, and the proximity of Gurza to the port of Utika and the saltus Domitianus (or on another view, to the port of Hadrumetum, 150 km. to the west - the siting of this particular Gurza, two of which are known, being contentious)³⁰ held obvious attractions. We have the authority of Cicero, Nepos, Pliny the Elder, and Agennius Urbicus for the immense size of several privately-owned latifundia in Africa purchased during the late republic and early empire by Italian senators³¹. The well-known inscription of Ain-el-Djemala (C25943) enables us to pinpoint the locality of some of these estates and the names of some of their

query (Tituli V (1982) pp.719-20, whilst G. Alföldy follows Barnes (see above), whose preference is for an origin in North Italy (Brixia - Tituli V (1982) p.366).

²⁸ It is unclear whether the saltus Domitianus was originally acquired by our proconsul, or by his grandfather Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, commander of the Marian forces in Africa in 81. The fact that our Ahenobarbus was only co-opted at Gurza whilst proconsul, however, indicates that estates here (whether or not adjacent to the saltus Domitianus) were probably only acquired recently cf. D. Kehoe, 'Lease Regulations for Imperial Estates in North Africa' II, ZPE, 59 (1985) p.165 n.76, for the view that the saltus Domitianus may equally well have belonged to the consular brothers Cn. Domitius Lucanus (PIR, D152) and Cn. Domitius Tullus (PIR, D167).

²⁹ See in particular Suetonius, Nero 4 'Praeturae consulatusque honore equites Romanos matronasque ad agendum mimum produxit in scaenam; venationes et in circo et in omnibus urbis regionibus dedit, munus etiam gladiatorium, sed tanta saevitia, ut necesse fuerit Augusto clam frustra monitum edicto coercere'.

³⁰ See most recently, P. Romanelli, 'Le due tavole in bronzo di patronato di comunità africane conservate nel Museo dell' Accademia', *Annuario dell'Accademia etrusca di Cortona*, XVIII (1979) pp.479-87.

³¹ Cicero, *Pro Caelio*, 30,72, *Ad Fam* 12,21, and 29; Nepos, *Atticus* 12,4, cited by R.M. Haywood, 'Roman Africa', *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, vol. IV, New Jersey (1959), ed. Tenney Frank p.29. Pliny the Elder, *NH*, 18,35 cited by ib., p.84. Agennius Urbicus in C. Thulin, ed., *Corpus Agrimensorum Romanorum* I (1913) 45, cited by P.D.A. Garnsey, 'Rome's African Empire under the Principate', *Imperialism in the Ancient World*, ed. P.D.A. Garnsey, and C.R. Whittaker, Cambridge (1978) p.225. Note Garnsey's comment (ib.): 'It may be suggested that a large number of villages in North Africa were closely linked to, if not fully integrated with, villa-based estates'.

owners³². Multiple holdings in Africa, traceable for none, can be surmised for all the wealthiest of these magnates both from the desirability and availability of the land itself, and from the routine possession or acquisition by senators of widely displaced realty. Agennius Urbicus cites an early (Augustan?) source for the frequency of legal action between these Italian landlords and local communities³³. It may well have been to forestall this sort of confrontation, that the pagus of Gurza ventured to co-opt Ahenobarbus. Certainly the inequality of the contracting parties on the tabula was extreme. Although the contract is formalised on the Gurzan side by the 'senatus populusque', the community is, in fact, no more than an artificial coalescence of three civitates stipendiarii, whose representatives all bear Punic names (Ammicar, Boncar and Muthunbal)³⁴. The collective dignity of Gurza's senate was scarcely sufficiently imposing in itself, to realistically anticipate a successful appeal to the authority of the proconsul for his personal patronage and protection. The gesture seems rather to have been one of appeasement by villagers, either tenants or neighbours, faced with the situation of a new and formidable landlord in their midst. In these circumstances, Ahenobarbus might cheerfully accept their fealty with no greater sense of obligation towards his new clients than that normally reserved by domini towards those living on or near their estates.

No personal connection between the third example, the proconsul C. Bruttius Praesens L. Fulvius Rusticus, L. f. Pomp., patron of Mactaris (A43) and Africa is discernible. In 169, some 35 years after the proconsulate of Bruttius, the community of Mactaris was still no more than a civitas, albeit one whose significance belies its status. From Trajan's reign, at least, Mactaris served as the centre of 64 (later 62) civitates (AE(1963)96). Mactaris' ancient (Massylian) importance, fertile valleys, and strategic situation athwart the intersection of major Roman roads, may be presumed to

³² The text, with translation and commentary appears in R. M. Haywood, *op. cit.*, pp.95-6, J.J. Van Nostrand, 'The Imperial Domains of Africa Proconsularis', Univ. of California Publications in History, XIV, (1925) pp.35-46.

³³ P.D.A. Garnsey *loc. cit.*

³⁴ On these civitates stipendiarii and the Gurzan tabula in general, see T.R.S. Broughton, *op. cit.*, pp.27, 85, 112-3, 186-7 and M. Benabou, *op. cit.*, pp.505-6.

have induced the establishment of a *conventus civium romanorum* here, far earlier than their first attested appearance in 169 (AE (1966) 514³⁵ . In size and importance, then, if not in actual civic status, Mactaris may be compared to *municipia* and *coloniae* found as clients of proconsuls (Mactaris was, in fact, directly promoted from *civitas* to *colonia* by Commodus). This, rather than the acquisition of land by the proconsul, probably explains Mactaris' success in co-opting Bruttius, but it may be noted that the Bruttii were great landowners, with estates in Volcei, Trebula Mutuesca, Amiternum, Rome and elsewhere.³⁶

³⁵ On Mactaris, see G. Charles Picard, 'Civitas Mactaritana', *Karthago VIII* (1957) pp.1-156; A. M'charek, 'Aspects de l'évolution démographique et sociale à Mactaris aux II^e et III^e siècles ap. J.C.', Tunis, 1982; Attilio Mastino, 'La ricerca epigrafica in Tunisia II. Il caso di Mactaris', *L'Africa Romana, Atti del I convegno di studio Sassari 16-17 dicembre 1983*, ed. Attilio Mastino, Sassari, 1984, pp.88-111. A brief résumé appears in C. Lepelley, 'Les cités de l'Afrique romaine au bas empire' II, 1981, Paris pp.289-91.

³⁶ On the Bruttii, see G. Camodeca, *Tituli V*, Roma, 1982, pp.152-3, 112 and 118.

Chapter IX Patrons of Curiae

The municipal institution of curiae flourished with particular vigour in Africa Proconsularis and Numidia throughout the second and third centuries. In all, some 50 communities document curiae, the overwhelming majority of these deriving from Africa Proconsularis (43)¹. Six are known from Numidia, all - for reasons unclear - outside of the Cirtan confederacy, while the only Mauretanian example has as its provenance Mophth[-] in Mauretania Sitifensis, a town near the Numidian frontier.

The relative abundance of (epigraphic) attestation of curiae in Africa (138 texts; 111 from Africa Proconsularis, 25 from Numidia, two from Mauretania) presents an astonishing contrast with the paucity of information from elsewhere in the empire. J. Gascou is able to list only four non-African communities where curiae are known, from a mere six texts². Scholarly opinion has recently united behind the Italic origins of curiae³, but the degree to which the success of their implantation in Africa was dependent on their having been grafted onto similar pre-existing Punic institutions is controversial⁴. T. Kotula admits in a recent espousal of this view, that 'il est impossible de prouver sensu stricto l'opinion que nous venons de réaffirmer'⁵. No certain testimony to the existence of curiae in Africa antedates Nerva, nor are any documented outside of towns of municipal or colonial status, with the sole exception of Lambaesis, headquarters of legio III Augusta and a non-peregrine community⁶.

¹ To the list of T. Kotula, 'Les curies municipales en Afrique romaine', Wrocław, 1968 pp.34-42, add the recent examples from Thuburnica (ZPE, 75(1988) pp.215-21=NB145), Musti (AE(1968) 588, 591, 593), Lambaesis (AE (1968) 646, cf. T. Kotula, op. cit., p.39 n.74), Mactaris (ined., cf. L'Africa Romana, 1 (1983), p.109 n.234) and Ureu (AE (1975) 877), and deduct that from Themetra (cf. J. Gascou, 'Les curies africaines, origine punique ou italienne?' Ant. Af., X (1976) pp.38-41). Note that the curiae known from a text at Hr. el Oust (C16417 = AE (1968) 609, cf. T. Kotula, op. cit., p.38 n.93) concern Musti. A probable reference to curiae occurs at Gens Bacchuiana (Z) '[epulu]mque? curia[libus? -]' (C12334=23925). T. Kotula's example from Avitta Bibba (op. cit., p.34 n.7) now seems unlikely - cf. C. Lepelley, 'Les cités', II pp.74-5 for a C4 date). The examples given for Theveste have been allocated to Africa Proconsularis, not Numidia.

2cf. J. Gascou, op. cit., p.44, n. 6-9. The communities are Lanuvium, Italia (C14.2114, 2120, 2126); colonia Iulia Turrus Libisonis, Sardinia (C13.7953); Malaca, Baetica (C2.1964) and Acinipo, Baetica (C2.1346).

³ J. Gascou, op. cit., T. Kotula, 'Les curies africaines : origine et composition. retractatio', Eos, 48 (1980) pp.133-40.

⁴ cf. J. Gascou, op. cit., pp.33-46 and T. Kotula, op. cit., pp.133-40.

⁵T. Kotula, op. cit., p.139.

⁶J. Gascou, op. cit., pp.37-41.

The evidence for curiae dries up abruptly again, at the end of the third century, the last verifiable example dating to the years 290-2 (C11774, Mididi). The demise of the institution, in the words of C. Lepelley, 'exprimerait l'élimination définitive du peuple de toute participation dans la vie municipale'⁷.

There is evidence suggesting that within these narrow chronological confines imposed by our sources, the original democratic basis on which Africa's curiae were formed was supplanted by the time of the Severans, and a more élitist system introduced⁸. That all eligible citizens were initially enrolled into curiae is manifest from a text of Trajanic - Hadrianic dating, erected by the 'o[rdo et popul]us in cu[ri]as cont[ri]butus' at Thubursicu Numidarum (ILAlgI1295)⁹. Evidence for a change in this state of affairs derives from three communities, Thamugadi, Ureu and Musti, in the early third century. In the years 211-2, an album of the curia Commodiana from Thamugadi (AE (1982) 958) lists only 52 curiales. M. Le Glay, putting Thamugadi's citizen population at (very roughly) 1,700 - 2,500, and assuming both a total of curiae similar to that known for neighbouring Lambaesis and elsewhere (10)¹⁰, and an approximately equal number of curiales per curia, estimates the total of Thamugadi's curiales to be about only 1/4 of the citizen base at this date¹¹. A recent text from Ureu establishes beyond doubt that a gulf between curiales and other citizens was in existence here by the early C3 (AE (1975) 877 - 'epulum curialib(us) et universis civibus dedit')¹². From Musti, we also know that at a similar date (the reign of Severus Alexander), curiales were themselves graded into a hierarchy (AE (1968) 588, 593)¹³. It may be, that the division of curiae into 'classes' as at Musti, where at least

⁷ 'Les cités', I p.141, cf. T. Kotula, 'Les curies municipales', pp.137-40.

⁸ J. Gascou, op. cit., pp.46-8, T. Kotula, 'Les curies africaines', pp.140-6.

⁹ T. Kotula, op. cit., p.145, and J. Gascou, op. cit., p.47 n.3.

¹⁰ The names of 10 curiae are known for Lambaesis (cf. T. Kotula, 'Les curies municipales', p.39 n.1-11 and 11 for Lepcis Magna (ibid., pp.34-5 n.17-28). Althiburos (ibid., p.34 n.3 and 5), Mactaris (ined., cf. L'Africa Romana I (1983) p.109 n. 234) and Mopth [-] (T. Kotula, op. cit., p.42 n.1) specifically give the total of their curiae as 10, Thuburbo Maius (ibid., p.37 n.73) as 11.

¹¹ M. Le Glay, 'Les curiales de la curia Commodiana de Timgad', Epigraphica, 42 (1980) p.116 (cf. J. Gascou, op. cit., pp. 46-7 and T. Kotula, op. cit., pp.65-6).

¹² J. Peyras, L. Maurin, 'Ureu. Municipium Uruensium', Paris, 1974 pp.27-31, cf. J. Gascou, op. cit., p.47, M. Leglay, op. cit., p.116, T. Kotula, 'Les curies africaines', pp.140-1, 146.

¹³ cf. J. Gascou, op. cit., pp. 47-8, T. Kotula, op. cit., p.146.

three classes of one curia are known (AE (1968) 593), was an alternative to the outright exclusion of part of the community's citizens. As T. Kotula notes, a community as small as Musti would have difficulty filling the tiered structure of its curiae if some of its citizens were simultaneously also excluded¹⁴.

Texts from two other centres, Althiburos and Sufetula, suggest that the dismantling of the democratic processes originally associated with Africa's curiae occurred piecemeal throughout the C3, the impetus deriving from the towns themselves, rather than from any overt pressure by the imperial authorities. The texts employ similar formulae - 'populus curiar(um) X' (C1828) and 'populus universus curiarum' (ILA137,138 cf. C11340, 11349) - and closely parallel that, seen from Thubursicu Numidarum, 'popul]us in cu[rias cont]ributus'¹⁵. The texts from Althiburos and Sufetula do not, however, date to the early C2, but to an indeterminate C3 date and the years immediately after 218, respectively¹⁶. Both communities apparently elected to continue enrolling all eligible citizens into their curiae at these dates, although refinements such as those adopted at Musti remain a possibility. Nine other African texts from eight communities (including one from Thamugadi, between 198-209 - AE (1941)96) make a distinction between the curiae or curiales and the *populus*, but none make it explicit whether *populus* refers to the town's citizens (as is implied from the three examples above) or to the people of sub-citizen status¹⁷. The chronology of the texts offers some support to the former interpretation, all but one of the texts (ILA12130) being datable to within a century, and all these postdating 169 (and note again, the Thamugadi example).

It is evident from what has been said that curiae meant different things in different places. Unfortunately, neither the chronology of Africa's eight attested patrons of

¹⁴ loc. cit..

¹⁵ cf. J. Gascou, op. cit., p.47 n.3.

¹⁶ A C3 date for C1828 is suggested by the fulsome eulogy directed to the honorand, and, perhaps, by a reference to the honorand's post of curator - 'temporibus cura[e suae]' (cf. T. Kotula, 'Les curies municipales', p. 34 n. 61. The text is omitted by F. Jacques, 'Les curateurs' and 'Le privilège de liberté'. A date soon after 218 for ILA137 is demanded by the expression 'equo publico ornato ab divis Severo et magno Antonino' and the texts ILA138, C11340 and 11349 appear to be roughly contemporary (cf. H. G. Pflaum, 'Carrières', p.825-6 and M. Christol, *Tituli IV* pp.146-7 n.12).

¹⁷ c.f. J. Gascou, op. cit., p.47 and T. Kotula, op. cit., p.59. T. Kotula, 'Les curies africaines', p.142 provides a convenient list of the nine references.

curiae, nor the location of their client allow³ us to determine whether their clients were or were not representative of all the eligible citizen community. The former might possibly apply to two C2 examples, although the dates are still relatively late (161-9, C131; 180-92, C138) and a decline in the democratic basis of curiae under the Antonines cannot be overruled. It would be interesting to know whether Thamugadi's curia Commodiana, client of the later of these two patrons (CB8) had in the order of 52 members from its conception, or suffered a diminution over the ensuing 20-30 years. Three of the remaining six patrons date to the third century, but two - a father and son (CB2,3) - occur within the first decade (c198-209), thus narrowly antedating our evidence for democratic decline from Thamugadi, Ureu and Musti, while the other (CB6) falls at some indeterminate date in the century. Finally, three others are of an imprecise C2 - C3 date (post 98-117, CB4,5; post 138, CB7).

No evidence at all emerges for patrons of curiae outside of Africa, and only [-I]ulius Comicianus Martialianus Eucarpus, patron of Thamugadi's curia Commodiana (CB8), occurs outside Africa Proconsularis. All eight patrons are local men. Six are attested only as patrons of single curiae, and none are of high status. Two appear with no rank at all (CB7,8), three others are simple priests and/or magistrates of their patria (CB4,5,6), and only one bears equestrian status, and that recent (CB1 - equo publico in quinq. decur. adlectus a divo Pio).¹⁹ The two patrons who remain are P. Messius Saturninus and his son P. Messius Augustinus Maecianus, patrons at Pheradi Maius of curiae universae (CB2,3). The father, a p(erfectissimus) v(ir) completed the tres militiae before holding an impressive series of posts in the imperial chancellery, culminating in the office of trecenarius a declamationib(us) Latinis. Saturninus' obvious legal qualifications suggested by the latter part of his career are confirmed by the Digest (II, 14, 50), where he is described as 'iuris peritus'. His son is described as 'equestris trib. honorib. functus, c.p.', the equestrian posts being almost certainly honorary in view of the age implied by c.p. (see p.179 n.46).

¹⁹ cf. H. G. Pflaum, 'Les juges de cinq décuries', p.170 - 'il est doté du cheval public et agrégé aux juges des cinq décuries par Antonin le Pieux, sans que nous puissions dire, si ces deux mesures ont été prises simultanément ou successivement'.

The rather threadbare evidence for Africa's patrons of curiae would seem to indicate (a) the restriction of co-optation to local figures - a conclusion to be anticipated from their secondary political influence in municipal affairs, (b) the relatively low status of patrons of single curiae, (c) the extreme rarity of curiae jointly co-opting a patron²⁰ and (d) the apparent separation of municipal and curial patronage, no patrons of curiae ever doubling as municipal patrons.

The first two findings are unsurprising and require little further comment. The reduction of our evidence for patrons of all the curiae to two individuals from a single text (the Messii of Pheradi Maius), while not so readily explicable,^{is} probably due to the difficulty of finding persons of sufficient means and high standing willing to accept a title, secondary in prestige to that of municipal patron, but burdened with obligations almost as onerous. Presumably too, persons already installed as municipal patron found little attraction in terms of additional prestige in accepting the title of patronus universae curiae. Individually, of course, all members of curiae were in any case an important part of a municipal patron's clientela. That they also benefitted as a group from the generosity of municipal patrons is, however, far less easily established. Municipal patrons and curiae appear in conjunction in only one text, a dedication from Bulla Regia to an anonymous senator described as patronus et alumnus coloniae (C155). The dedicands, universae curiae, specifically avoid describing the senator as their patron, and offer no motive for the erection of the dedication, although clearly it was occasioned by gratitude for some service or beneficia. Evidence for specific beneficia directed by a municipal patron towards curiae as a corporation can, perhaps, be extracted from two dedications from Gigthis to another senator, Q. Servaeus Fuscus Cornelianus (IB78B). One dedication is set up by all the curiae in conjunction with Servaeus' freedmen and their children, all of whom are described as being in receipt of an annual alimentary allotment from Servaeus (C22721). The other, is erected by the ordo of Gigthis ('Gigt(henses) publ(ice)'). While the first nowhere

²⁰ T. Kotula, 'Les curies municipales', pp. 70-1 n.73 compares the co-optation of the Messii by universae curiae with known instances of multiple patrocina by municipal patrons - 'les curies de Pheradi Maius ont pu imiter cet usage en contractant le patronat, l'une après l'autre'.

describes Servaeus as patron (either of Gigthis or its curiae), the second and presumably simultaneous dedication may well have described Servaeus as municipal patron. A three line lacuna in the text following Servaeus' cursus was indubitably devoted to a brief eulogy of the senator, in which mention of his patronate would be both apt and appropriate to his high status.

Despite the rarity of evidence for curiae being specifically singled out as recipients of beneficia by municipal patrons, all a community's citizens were clearly the beneficiaries from the various actions municipal patrons undertook on their behalf. The curiae appear to have been content to have allowed the formal expression of gratitude to become a virtual prerogative of the ordo from the outset. Their own separate vote of thanks presumably only marked exceptional liberalities, perhaps only those directly targeting them.

Honorific dedications erected by curiae in unison to individuals not described as patron are relatively numerous (39)²¹. Although normally erected on their own initiative, two examples do occur of dedications erected conjointly with the ordo (NB56, 93). Naturally enough, some of the dedications erected on their own initiative concern persons whose generosity (often testamentary) made the curiae direct beneficiaries²². Others, however (including both dedications erected with the ordo), honour individuals who benefitted the entire community or at least those of citizen status. Where the nature of the liberality is spelled out, it is apparent that the honorand acted with some degree of spontaneity or exceeded the return expected from their

²¹ The 38 dedications derive from 16 communities, honouring individuals ranging in status from senators to municipal dignitaries.

Senators (3) - Bulla Regia (AE (1964) 178 = C155), Gigthis (C22721 = IB78B), Sufetula (C11332 = NC7). Equestrians (8) - Mactaris (C11813=NB47), Sufetula (C11340=NB56, ILA138=NB57 ILA137=NB58), Theveste (ILAlgI3067=IB98A*), Thubursicu Numidarum (ILAlgI1301=IB67*), Uthina (C24017=NB42), Gouebar bou Aoun (ILAlgI95 & 96 = NB65).

Municipal Magistri and Family Members (21) - Madauros (AE(1931) 40=NB94), Sabratha (IRT118-25 cf. 117=NB108), Simitthu (C14612=NB119), Sufetula (C11345=NB136, C11349=NB137, C23226=NB138, ILA134=NB163, C11344 cf. AE (1957) 75*), Theveste (ILAlgI3070=NB74, ILAlgI3069=NB113, ILAlgI3064 = NB148, ILAlgI3068 = AE (1984) 937*, ILAlgI3071*), Thuburbo Maius (ILT728=NB120, ILA282), Thuburnica (ZPE, 75 (1988) pp.215-21 = NB145), Thubursicu Numidarum (ILAlgI1295=NB93), Thysdrus (C22852*), Ziqua (C10523=NB174), municipium Aurellium C[ommodianum?-(C12353=NB157, C12354=NB158).

Unknown(7) - Althiburos (C1828=IC26A)*, Cillium (C23207=NB140), Cincari (C1476A=NB150), Mactaris (C11814)*, Muzuc (C12096,* Sufetula (C11348=NB170), Theveste (ILAlgI3075-8)*.

NB. Asterisked texts are those where lacunae may have described the recipient as patron (see below p. 228).

²² IB78B, NB47, NB42.

assumption of a magistracy. In 12 instances the honorand is said to have provided a munus²³, and some of these were clearly exceptional affairs 'ob...singularem voluptatum editionem' (NB56), 'ob magnificentiam gladiatorii muneris quod civibus suis triduo edidit quo omnes priorum memorias supergressus est' (NB65) and 'ob....largamq. liberalitatem duplicis editionis ludorum' (NB136). In 5 other texts an unspecified liberalitas or largitio occasioned the erection²⁴, while in others we hear of the provision of building works or grain relief²⁵. It is tempting to see in the more or less voluntary and unexpected nature of the benefactions just related, a key to the rarity of dedications by curiae to municipal patrons, from whom a generous input into the community's prosperity was anticipated from the commencement of their co-optation. In the former case, expressions of gratitude by the curiae might act as a spur to emulation, whereas in the latter they would merely rubber-stamp the obligatory vote of thanks expected of the ordo, for services largely unavoidable.

Comparison of the honorific dedications erected by curiae acting in concert, and those erected by a single curia, indicate just how infrequent co-optation by the former must have been. In the 39 instances in which curiae agreed to act together to honour an individual with a statue (or, as in two instances, with a statue by each of the curiae - NB65 and IRT118-25), only once are the recipients described as patron. To the exception - the dedication at Pheradi Maius to the Messii (CB2-3) - there are 28 examples where non-mention of patronage is unambiguous, and 10 where lacunae allow for the possibility²⁶. The candidacy of all but one of the 10 potential patroni universae curiae is, however, considerably diminished for seven of municipal or unknown rank, and doubtful in the case of two 'equites honorifiques'. That honorands of sub-equestrian rank were unlikely candidates for co-optation may be judged from the high status of the two patrons of all the curiae known to us, (the Messii) and - more cogently, perhaps - from comparison with co-optation patterns for African

²³ munera - NB56, IB98A, NB65, 136, 137, 74, 113, 148, ILA1g13068, 3071, NB145, C22852.

²⁴ liberalitas/largitio - NB57, 163, 174, 150 170.

²⁵ buildings - IC26A, NB158, cf. 157, NB108 (cf. IRT117), NB145, grain relief - NC7.

²⁶ See n.21.

municipia for the period in which curiae are documented (the early C2 to the late C3). The doubt expressed for the two 'equites honorifiques' is warranted by the surprisingly high number of equestrian honorands clearly not termed patrons (6) including two career equestrians, one a procurator (NB56)²⁷. A more plausible candidate would appear to be the anonymous official - most probably, as T. Kotula suggests, a curator rei publicae (cf. n.16) - praised for his integritas and his provision - 'inter cetera [beneficia]' - of fountains at Althiburos (IC26A).

Dedications by individual curiae to local citizens are comparatively far less common, and are marked by the generally low status of the recipients (only one, the equo publico, M. Manlius Modestus Quietianus, patron of the curia Publicia, CB1, being more than a municipal dignitary), and the high proportion of recipients who were patrons. Besides the six attested dedications to patrons, we possess only eight other texts erected to individuals by single curiae, all but two of them epitaphs or memorials to a deceased benefactor²⁸. The two remaining dedications concern local magistrates honoured 'ob merita'²⁹. While it is apparent that none of the eight honorands were patrons, there are no means of distinguishing them from five of the six recorded patrons of single curiae of similar status. The curiae offer no indication as to what occasioned the dedication of statues to three of their patrons (CB5,7,8), while another two cloak the actual nature of the patron's beneficia in abstractions 'ob meri[t]a' (CB4 - cf. the same phrase to the two 'non-patrons' above) and 'ob eximium amoremet praestantem fidem' (CB6). The reticence shown by these texts in revealing the motivation behind their erection, has, of course, no lack of parallels among honorific bases set up by municipia to patrons and other individuals. The eligibility of prospective patrons was almost certainly primarily determined by the measure of their generosity, actual or promised, but how this was set is impossible to establish. We may add that the dedication to the two Messii by all the curiae also offers no reason for

²⁷ The other was an a militiis (NB65) whose generous provision of three days of gladiatorial games has been seen.

²⁸ Neapolis (C974), Simitthu (C14613), Lambaesis (C3298, 3302, 3516), Mascula (C17705).

²⁹ Thubursicu Numidarum (ILAlg1298), Zitha (C11008).

its erection. Despite the pronounced legal skills of the father, P. Messius Saturninus, it is difficult to imagine a context in which curiae, either separately or in unison would require legal representation (and no examples are known), unless it be that suits arose in the midst of a re-organisation, involving the downgrading and/or exclusion of curiales (the date would suit).

The only example we possess of a patronus curiae whose munificence is spelled out, is also the only known patron of a curia above municipal rank, the equo publico, M. Manlius Modestus Quietianus (CB1), seen above. The dedication to Quietianus at Curubis is said to have been erected 'ob singularem in patriam munificentiam theatro' and its early (Julian) assumption of the rank of colonia, suggests that the town was comparable in size to Calama, a medium-large community, likewise of long ancestry and promoted to municipium by Trajan. The cost of Quietianus' theatre at Curubis may, therefore, have approximated the 400,000 sesterces spent by a local flaminica on the theatre at Calama³⁰. No architectural trace survives, unfortunately, of the theatre at Curubis³¹ to establish whether it was of comparable size and construction type to that brilliantly reconstructed from the ruins at Calama. In any event, Quietianus' outlay was clearly of an exceptionally generous order. Finally it may be observed that munificence on a similar, or even grander scale, is recorded for three municipal dignitaries at Thuburnica, municipium Aurellium C[ommodianum? -] and Sabratha³², and gratefully acknowledged by all the curiae in unison in the first two instances, and by the 'ordo Sabrathensium populo postulante' in the second, a dedication to the benefactor's son, C. Flavius Pudens, which was also matched by separate statues erected by all the curiae individually. The failure to initiate co-optation by the curiae must be presumed to have hinged on the relatively minor status of the persons involved, since their generosity was so manifestly well received. The benefactions, were, in the first two cases the embellishment of an amphitheatre and the provision of

³⁰ ILAlg I286-7, (=NB141) cf. P. MacKendrick, op. cit., p.256, J.C. Lachaux, 'Théâtres et amphithéâtres d'Afrique proconsulaire', Aix-en-Provence, 1979, pp.47-9.

³¹ J-C Lachaux, op. cit., p.66.

³² NB145, 157-8, 108.

a market, and, in the other the provision of a water supply with a sum of over HS 200,000 for its upkeep.

Chapter X Patrons of Provinces

The evidence relating to patrons of provinces is meagre - for the African provinces, as for the rest of the empire. During the republic, some provinces attest governors as patrons, and the evidence from Sicily suggests that here, at least, the practice may have been regular¹. For the empire, on the other hand, attestation of provincial patrons does not begin to become at all frequent until the fourth century, and then only nine can be enumerated, four from the African provinces (PB1, PA2, PD3, PA11) and five from elsewhere². The three centuries preceding the accession of Diocletian provide a total of only 13 provincial patrons. Of these, seven concern patrons of an African province (in every instance Mauretania - PB4, PD5-5a, PC6, PD7, PB8, PB9, PC10)³.

¹ Patrons of Sicily include the infamous C. Verres (Cicero, *Verr.* (II) II 46 (114), the Claudii Marcelli (ibid. (II)IV 61 (69-81), Cn. Cornelius Lentulus (ibid. (II) II 42 (103)) and M. Marcellus Aeserninus (ibid. (II)IV 42 (91)). - cf. Harmand, pp. 106-116. M. Gelzer, ('The Roman Nobility', Oxford, 1969, pp.86-7) adds Caesar, patron of Hispania Ulterior (B. *Hisp.* 42.2) and Cato, patron of Cyprus and Cappadocia (Cic. *Fam.* 15.4.15, fin. 4.56) to Harmand's list. See also AE (1967) 532 for C. Clodius Pulcher, patron of Cyrene a little after 92 BC.

² Africa's *patroni provinciae* appear in Volume III. Patrons from elsewhere are listed below. Note that one patron, C. Iulius Galerius Asper, appears twice, being patron of *tres Hispaniae*, *Britannia* and *duae Mauretaniae*.

(a) Principate

- (1) Creta - M. Nonius Balbus, M. f., *procos.* (prov. *Cretae et Cyrenarum*), 30 BC (C10.1430-2).
- (2) Britannia - M. Vettius Valens, M. f. An., [*iurid(icus)*] *provinc. Britan.*, c137 (C11.383).
- (3) Britannia - C. Iulius Galerius Asper, *cos.* (cf. PD5 for *cursus*), 211 (C14.2508).
- (4) Hispaniae III - C. Iulius Galerius Asper, *cos.* (cf. PD5 for *cursus*), 211 (C14.2516).
- (5) Hispaniae III - M. Bombius Rusticus, v.e., *advoc. fisci sacrar. cogn. Hisp. trium*, C3 (AE (1930) 148).
- (6) Dalmatia - C. Iulius Silvanus Melanio, [*proc. argentariarum (Dalmatiarum)*], beg. C3 (C3.12732).
- (7) Alpes Maritimae - C. Subrius Secundinus, *flamen*, C3 (C5.7917).
- (8) Cyprus - [-] Vilius Ma(ron)ius, (T.B. Mitford 'New Inscriptions from Roman Cyprus', *Opuscula Archeologica* VI, Lund (1950) p.30).

(b) Dominate

- (9) Sicilia - Betitius Perpetuus Arzygius, *corrector Siciliae*, 312-34 (D8843).
- (10) Tuscia-Umbria - Betitius Perpetuus Arzygius, *consularis Tusciae et Umb.* 312-34 (D1251).
- (11) Apulia-Calabria - L. Nonius Verus, *correct(or) Apuliae et Calab[riae]*, 317-24 (C11.831).
- (12) Venetia-Istria - (Sex. Claudius) Petronius Probus, *praefectus praetorio per Illyricum Italiam et Africam*, 378 (D1265).
- (13) Tarraconensis - Paulinus, *governor of Tarraconensis*, ante 382 (Ausonius, 3 (Parentalia) 24, 11 ff).
- (14) Lugudunensis III - Val(erius) Dalmatius, *rector (Lugdun. III)*, end C4 - C5 (D8987)

NB. For the probability that Pliny was patron of Baetica, see n.5. Potentially *patronus provinciae* (by analogy with n.7 above) is also the anonymous 'flam(en) et patronus' of AE (1924) 61 (cf. J. Deininger, 'Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit von Augustus bis zum Ende des dritten Jahrhunderts n. Chr.', München (1965) p.110 and n.6. J. Nicols' rejection of two Bithynian proconsuls as patrons of Bithynia appears sound ('Zur Verleihung öffentlicher Ehrungen in der römischen Welt', Chiron, IX (1979) p.256. These are C. Cadius Rufus (PIR, C6 contra J. Deininger, *op. cit.*, p.62) and L. Mindius Pollio (PIR, M598).

³ See above list. There are seven patrons of Mauretania and another seven of provinces outside of Africa. The total is 13 not 14 - see above re C. Iulius Galerius Asper.

Besides Mauretania, only two African provinces certainly record provincial patrons, Numidia (PA2, PD3) and Tripolitana (PB1). There is also the example of Fl(avius) Mallius Theodorus (PA11), patron of an unnamed African province (the source is Claudian, cf. Krause 170). Three of these four appear at a date well advanced in the fourth century (PB1 - 340-50, PA2 - 343, PA11 - 377), while the nomen of the fourth (Fl(avius) - PD3), indicates a Constantinian dating at the earliest. As seen above, all the Mauretanian examples date to the principate. None are known prior to the second century, and the majority date to the third (PD5-5a, PC6, PB8, PB9, PC10 and cf. PD7, dating c161-217).

That Mauretania with its far smaller share of the corpus of African epigraphy should produce so disproportionately large a total of provincial patrons may indicate that the practice of co-opting provincial patrons in Africa was confined to Mauretania, possibly until as late as the provincial re-organisation of the fourth century. This premise is less certain for Numidia, which did not gain provincial status until Severus, and time may eventually rectify the current gap in the Numidian record. The province's administrative structure (governed by legates) and relatively low level of urbanisation make Numidia comparable with Britannia and Tarraconensis, both of whom attest a provincial patron (in the person of C. Iulius Galerius Asper) after Numidia's promotion to provincia.

Africa Proconsularis, by contrast, where the evidence for provincial patrons rests on only one ambiguous fourth century text⁴, presents a valid argumentum ex silentio, when one bears in mind that the total of inscriptions recorded during the long history of the province (excluding those from the later sub-divisions of Byzacena and Tripolitana) easily exceeds 15,000. Moreover, none of the eight provinces (besides

⁴ See IPCI. The text, from Sicca Veneria, is very fragmentary. The failure of any other patron of Africa Proconsularis to materialise renders the reading '[patro]no provinciai' doubtful. The suggestion, initially Mommsen's (cf. C15878 adn.) is not queried by Krause 169 (cf. CIL VIII indices and C. Lepelley, 'Les Cités', II p.159). The dedication by the provincia Africae in 375-8 to the proconsul of Africa Iulius Festus Hymetius of two gilt statues (one at Carthage, the other at Rome) provides a striking illustration of an eminently worthy candidate for co-optation, whose co-optation nevertheless did not eventuate (C6.1736=D1256 cf. NA14). Despite specific praise for relieving a famine and reviving the provincial priesthood, Hymetius is nowhere described as patron (see also C. Lepelley, 'Les Cités', II, pp. 19-21, T. Kotula, 'Les Assemblées provinciales dans l'Afrique romaine sous le bas-empire' (résumé), pp.176-7.

Mauretania) known to have had provincial patrons during the principate - Crete, Cyprus, Britain, Dalmatia, the Maritime Alps and the Three Spains - may be compared to Africa Proconsularis in importance, although two, Crete and Baetica, were similarly administered by proconsuls. One must assume that the province's rich resources and profound urbanisation made it an easy matter to attract powerful advocates in defence of its interests - either its own citizens, or others of influence - without recourse to co-optation. In this regard, we may note that an action brought by Lepcis Magna and several private citizens against a former proconsul, Marius Priscus, succeeded in attaining the exile of the accused, and enabled two of Rome's most proficient orators, Pliny and Tacitus, to acquire no little glory in taking on the case as *patroni causarum*. The case was evidently a cause célèbre as may be judged not only from Pliny's account, but by Juvenal's recollection 'of Priscus' excesses a decade or more later⁵. Again in the fifth century, we hear of a *legatio* undertaken by a certain Bubulcus, *spectabilis vir* on behalf of the province (C. Th. 12, 1, 186).

Comparison of the choice of provincial patron, from the principate to the dominate, illustrates a clear preference in the later period for patrons who were governors of the province. In the principate, while some provincial patrons were also imperial officials, they were not - with one exception - provincial governors. The exception concerns the earliest known provincial patron under the empire, M. Nonius Balbus, proconsul of Crete and Cyrenaica, and patron of the '*commune Cretensium*' in 30 BC (C10.1430-

⁵ Pliny Ep. 2,11;2,12;3,9;6,29;10,39 (cf. Juvenal I 49-50, VIII 120). Pliny had earlier also acted as *patronus causarum* for the Baetici in 93 (Ep. III 4.4, 4.6, VI 29.8, VII 33.4-8). In a bid to secure his services a second time (AD100) representatives of the Baetici (*legati provinciae Baetici*) produced at a senate hearing a treaty (*patrocini foedus*), and Pliny adds that his decision to take on the case rested in part on '*publici hospiti iura*'. Taken at face value the words suggest that Pliny was patron of Baetica, and this is the interpretation of A.N. Sherwin White, 'The Letters of Pliny the Younger: A Historical and Social Commentary', Oxford, 1966, p.265 and J. Deininger, *op. cit.*, pp.129-30. J. Nicols, however, pointing to the rarity of senatorial provincial patrons in the principate, suggests that Pliny was *hospes* and/or *patronus* of some Baetican communities, rather than *patronus provinciae* ('Pliny and the Patronage of Communities', *Hermes*, (VIII (1980) pp.372-4). Such an implication, while possible, is nowhere demanded by the text, and the exact nature of the *foedus patrocini* is best left *sub iudice*. It should be noticed, however, that Nicols, by error, follows Harmand in assigning a late C3 date to two of the senatorial provincial patrons. M. Vettius Valens was patron of Britain in 137 and thus a near contemporary of Pliny (cf. H.G. Pflaum, '*Les Fastes de la Province de Narbonnaise*', Paris, 1978 pp.64-5), whilst C. Iulius Galerius Asper was patron of several provinces in 212 (cf. PIR, I334), without having served as administrator in any. Pliny, of course, was likewise bound by a *foedus patrocini*, without having administered Baetica. The redating of both men obviously reduces the need, as Nicols saw it, 'to find some way of explaining the *patrocinium* without making Pliny *patronus provinciae*' (*op. cit.*, p.373).

1432). We may note that this example concerns only a relatively remote and minor province, and not even all of that, so far as our information allows, but only the least important region, Crete.

It is clear from Caesar's *lex Iulia repetundarum* of 59 BC that patronage of either communities or provinces was illegal for acting administrators (cf. J. Nicols, 'Zur Verleihung', p.246). It is equally clear, however, that infringements of this ruling occur between 59 and the strengthening of the provisions of the *lex* by Augustus in AD11 (Dio 56, 25, 6). In Africa Proconsularis alone, three certain instances can be cited (M. Aemilius Lepidus, Thabraca, 37-6 BC; L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, Gurza, 12 BC; and L. Caninius Gallus, Lepcis Magna, AD5-6 - cf. A3, 4, 6), and Nicols cites a further example from Asia (op. cit., p.247). Acting governors can again be found as municipal patrons between AD11 and 62, (cf. A10, 11, 18, 21), when Nero further tightened the rules (Tac., ann. 15, 22-4), as in the years immediately thereafter (cf. A23, 25, 26, 27-7a, 29, 30, 43, 44, 49, 52, 60, 61, 89A, 120 - all proconsuls, AD62 - 267). Two assumptions drawn by Nicols (op. cit.) from this contradictory evidence are almost certainly correct.

The first, that Caesar's *lex* ceased to be effective during the civil wars (p.247) gains credence from the earliest example of an acting governor as municipal patron after 59, viz. one of the triumviri, M. Aemilius Lepidus (A3). Nicols' second assumption, that the provisions of Augustus and Nero relate purely to the co-optation of provincial patrons, likewise makes sense of the evidence (pp.253-60). Augustus' decision to give legal recognition to the *de facto* municipal patronage of acting governors may, however, have been taken much earlier than his decision in AD11 to extend the period of non-co-optation from the term of a governor's office to a 60 day period after expiry of office (contra Nicols, op. cit., p.260). It is probable, however, that the legal ban on co-opting acting governors as provincial patrons was still in force during the triumvirate or at least soon after the termination of the civil wars, given the potential political dangers involved. M. Nonius Balbus' patronage of Crete would, on this view, not have extended beyond the *commune Cretensium* to embrace Cyrenaica.

The ban on co-opting acting governors as provincial patrons (as opposed to the co-optation of more junior acting administrators) appears to have enjoyed considerable longevity, the earliest attested example (besides the dubious case of M. Nonius Balbus) being that of L. Nonius Verus, patron and corrector of the province Apulia et Calabria in 317-24 (C11.831). In the fourth century, the number of provincial patrons who were also provincial governors admits no exceptions outside of Africa, although it must be stated that the provinces were by this time considerably diminished in size. In Africa, two of the four attested provincial patrons were certainly provincial governors - Ceionius Italicus (PA2), and Fl. Mallius Theodorus (PA11), patrons of Numidia and an unspecified African community respectively - and the other two possibly so. These are, firstly, the clarissimus Fl. Honoratianus (PD3), taken by the editors of PLRE to have been 'advocatus at the Numidian bar', although the possibility of his being consularis of Numidia is not ruled out (Honoratianus, 3); and secondly, the anonymous v.p. patron of Tripolitana (PB1). The latter has been conflated by Engesser with the v.p., praeses provinciae Tripolitanae, mentioned in the same text (Flavius Victor Calpurnius), but the context makes this implausible⁶. An alternative reading of the text, however, allows for the possibility that the anonymous patron of the province was an important administrator, rather than an apparently local vir perfectissimus. The editors of IRT55 (followed by C. Lepelley, 'Les cités', II, p.391 n.34 and Krause 172) read '[-] a v(iro) p(erfectissimo) [p]atrono prov(inciae) dedican[te-]', but the letter 'a' immediately after the first lacuna suggests a different interpretation '[(nomen)] a(genti) v(ices) p(raefectorum) [p(raetorio), p]atrono prov(inciae)' etc. (cf. IRT57-8 for another vicarius at Sabratha)⁷.

Of the thirteen provincial patrons attested for the principate, eight are men of local, or presumed local, origin. All but two of these, the flamen C. Subrius Secundinus, patron of the tiny province Alpes Maritimae (C5.7917), and [-]Vilius Ma(ron)ius,

⁶ No such identification is made by C. Lepelley, 'Les cités', II, p.374 n.9, Krause 171, or the editors of IRT55 and PLRE (see Calpurnius). The latter, however, fail to enter the anonymous v.p. in their volume.

⁷ Antonius Dracontius, AD364-7. If the attribution of the post vicarius is correct, our anonymous may be identified with one of the three vicarii Africae known for this period, Petronius (AD340), Iulius Ebulidas (AD344) and Caesonianus (AD348), for whom cf. PLRE Fasti p.1079.

patron of Cyprus (*Opuscula Arch.*, VI p.30), had as their client Mauretania⁸. The Mauretanian patrons comprise two minor officials, an a militis, Q. Gargilius Martialis (PC6), whose heroic defence of his patria eventually cost him his life, and the princeps, dispunctor and curator of Quiza, C. Iulius Honoratus (PC10), possibly a near contemporary⁹. The remaining four local patrons of the province of Mauretania do not appear to have been persons of particularly high status. The rank of two, Amonius (PD7) and [-]lius (or [-]lus) Albinus (PB8) is unknown. The single name of the former, coupled with the fact that, in company with a local II vir, he appears as joint dedicator of a stone to an imperial freedman, militates against high status. An alternative reading of the text, while unusual, appears to me possible, as it both accounts for the apparent low status of Amonius, and denies him the title of patron(us) prov(inciae), viz. Alexandro A(ug) n(ostro) lib(erto) proc(uratore) po[r(torium)] Tib. Claudius Sabinus II vir et Amonius patron(o) prov(identissimo)' (cf. C2750 'provi[dentissimo] praes[idi]'). Albinus' patronate of the province of Mauretania Caesariensis raises no such query. Albinus appears to have been a native of Caesarea¹⁰, and the father (or grandfather) of a clarissimus puer. A statue to a member of his family was erected 'decreto concili prov[inciae] Mauretaniae Caesar[iensis]', and its cost reimbursed by the recipient. As for the two other local provincial patrons, the flamen and sacerdos Urbis Romae from Tipasa, [C? Iulius] Valens (PB4) and the anonymous a commentariis praefectorum praetorio ee. vv. from Caesarea (PB9), no stated motivation for their co-optation is provided, but the latter's post clearly offered potential advantage to his province.

One patron of Mauretania - the senator, C. Iulius Galerius Asper (PD5-5a) - remains unmentioned. Although neither a native, nor an administrator of the province, his

⁸ Note, however, that M. Bombius Rusticus, patron of the Three Spains, while clearly an African from his nomen (cf. H.G. Pflaum, 'L'Afrique Romaine', p.130) may have taken up residence in Tarraco, where he was also patron (cf. AE (1930) 148).

⁹ A date from the end C3 - C4 is assigned Honoratus by Krause 173, cf. C. Lepelley, 'Les cités, II p.540, who similarly dates the text to 'notre période (post Diocletian) ou peu auparavant'. A dating between the mid-end third century seems preferable, given the posts Honoratus shares with Martialis' father, viz. curator et dispunctor rei publicae. Honoratus admittedly bears no tribe or filiation as do Martialis and his father, but these terms of identification were already being phased out, the last datable African, example being in 268 (C26582, cf. AE (1981) 17).

¹⁰ He is so taken by M. Le Glay, *Tituli V* p.777.

connection with his client, as with that of the three provinces of Spain (and presumably also that of Britain)¹¹, clearly rested on his reputation as a successful advocate. A dedication to him by both the Mauretaniae and the tres Hispaniae, describes him as 'orator praestantissimus defensor clientium fidelissimus'. The joint dedication by five provinces, suggests that Asper successfully undertook the defence of all five in one action.

Defence of their clients at court was clearly a pivotal rôle for provincial patrons, and one performed by persons of far less eminence than Asper. This may be assumed, for example, in the case of C. Subrius Secundinus, a provincial patron holding only a municipal dignity (the flaminiate), whose eloquence the province praises - 'pietatis eloquentiae morum magistri'. Other examples confirm the importance of provincial patrons as advocates. Thus, under the principate, we also find instances of a iuridicus Britanniae (C11.383) and an 'advoc(atus) fisci sacrar(um) cogn(itionum) Hisp(aniarum) trium' (AE (1930) 148), and legal defence may similarly have been anticipated from Mauretania's a commentariis, seen earlier. Under the dominate, may be noted Fl. Honoratianus, also seen above, whom his clientes (apparently the province of Numidia) depict as 'custos iuris ac legum, parens totius humanitatis, amicus civilitatis et iustitiae' etc. Outside of Africa, laudations in a similar vein accrue to a patron of Venetia - Istria ('nobilitatis culmini, litterarum et eloquentiae lumini' etc. - D1265) and most particularly to a patron of Lugudensis III ('Ius ad iustitiam

¹¹ C. Iulius Galerius Asper is honoured on two separate dedications (C14.2508-9) by the provinces of Mauretania Tingitana and Britannia. Another dedication to an anonymous 'orator praestantissimus', patron of both Mauretaniae and the three Spains (C14.2516), is generally assumed to have been the father of the patron of Tingitana and Britain, C. Iulius Asper, proconsul Africae (cf. C14.2516 adn., PIR, I182, G. Barbieri, 'L'albo', n.285). The stone was found together with the other two, and with another eleven dedications on which are dedications by clients, whilst his son appears on nine stones, all dedications by clients or amici. The identification of C14.2516 with the proconsul appears to rest principally on a remark of Dio (78.5.3), but his consular son may already have acquired a similar reputation, justifying the epithet 'orator praestantissimus'. The appearance of Mauretania Tingitana on two dedications to the son, may simply have been occasioned by two suits, in which the son acted on their behalf - once for Tingitana alone, and again for both the Mauretaniae together with the Spanish provinces (cf. Pliny's defence of Baetica on two occasions, Ep. III.4.4-6, VI.29.8). Alternatively, all the Mauretanian and Spanish provinces may have elected to honour the son independently, as well as in a single joint dedication. H. Halfmann ascribes the epithet 'orator praestantissimus' to the son, but this may have been unintentional, as he describes him only as patron of Britain and Tingitana (Tituli V p.642). Given the fact that the son is the only member of the family certainly attested as patronus provinciae, and appears on nine honorific dedications, while his father is known by none, I have preferred to see in him the 'orator praestantissimus', but obviously with reservations.

revocare aequumque tueri Dalmatio lex est, quam dedit alma fides. Bis sex scripta tenet praetorisque omne volumen, doctus et a sanctis condita principibus. Hic idem interpres legum legumque minister quam prudens callet, tam bonus exequitur.' - D8987).

Where a provincial patron was also an administrator, praise of the administration was a frequent feature of dedications by the province, at least for the late empire, but there is nothing which usefully distinguishes these from contemporary eulogies to other administrators who were honoured by municipal clients, or indeed by towns who do not appear to have been clients at all¹². We may note, however, that while the Numidian consularis, Ceionius Italicus, is not specifically known to have been a native of Cirta, the dedication to him as patron, by Cirta and the province of Numidia, includes 'liberalitas' amongst his virtues. 'Liberalitas' is never thus associated in other honorific dedications to administrators from outside the province in African epigraphy, and this ought probably to be taken as an indication of local origo, rather than something germane to his provincial patronate. Other Ceionii were established elsewhere in Africa, at Bulla Regia (C168) and, perhaps, Cillium (B162), and the family of Ceionius Italicus may represent a Numidian branch of the gens¹³.

From the example of Q. Gargilius Martialis (PC6), it is evident that defence of a military, rather than a legal nature, might occasion co-optation, but the example is unique, and occurs in the midst of a military crisis, unparalleled in Mauretanian history. The dedication to Martialis is of interest in another respect, in that it is only the second instance known from Africa of a dedication by the ordo to an attested municipal patron which fails to mention the honorand's patronate¹⁴. Martialis is

¹² For Africa, cf. the eulogies to Ceionius Italicus (PA2) and Fl. Mallius Theodorus (PA11). More typical are those from elsewhere in the empire (cf. D1251, 8843). For eulogies to contemporary governors, cf. 'Beneficia et Merita', list (A) chapter XII.

¹³ For the Ceionii in Numidia see M.T.W. Arnhem, *op. cit.*, pp. 157-8, who observes that four of the 24 Numidian consulares of the fourth century were Ceionii (cf. also J. Matthews, *op. cit.*, pp.27-8).

¹⁴ Lepcis Magna provides a second example. The ordo erected two statues to L. Volusius Bassus Cerealis, c.v., one describing him as patron (IRT544), the other not (IRT543). The text omitting mention of the patronate is the later of the two, since Cerealis is here named 'c.v. et cos. cur. reip. suae', but in the other 'c.v., legatus'. Cerealis was originally taken as legatus in the sense of ambassador for his patria (IRT index p.264, C. Lepelley, 'Les Cités', II p.35), M. Corbier, *Tituli V* p.726), but M. Christol, 'Hommages publics à Lepcis Magna à l'époque de Dioclétien : choix du vocabulaire et qualité du destinataire', *RHDFE*, LXI (1983) pp. 331-43 followed by G. di Vita Evrard, 'L. Volusius Bassus Cerealis, légat du proconsul d'Afrique.

known to have been patronus patriae some years earlier, whilst only militiae petitor (cf. C286). The omission of his municipal patronate on the later dedication, unless an oversight, was presumably motivated by a desire to record only the most impressive title. We know from two other African examples, that municipal patronage was not subsumed by the title patronus provinciae, and parallels also exist from Italy and Spain¹⁵. While there is an argument that all those recording this dual patronage were locals or, at least, residents of the client community, there is no particularly cogent reason why dual co-optation should not also have included administrators of external origo¹⁶.

It is regrettable that the texts recording five provincial patrons of Mauretania (PB4, PD7, PB8, PB9, PC10) and another of Tripolitana (PB1) offer almost no indication as to how those concerned might have fulfilled their patronal obligations. The capacity of two to provide legal defence is suggested by their post (the anonymous a commentariis and vicarius (?), PD7 and PB1 - see above). For the remainder, whose status is either low or unknown, a similar rôle must be deemed possible, in view of the attested eloquentia recorded for the flamen and provincial patron, C. Subrius Secundinus (see above). Our lack of information is directly attributable to the nature of the texts, two of which are epitaphs erected privately (PB4, PC10), another a joint dedication to an imperial freedman (PD7), and the last a fragmentary dedication to a family member by decree of the provincial council (PB8).

T. Claudius Aurelius Aristobulus et la création de la province de Tripolitaine', *L'Africa Romana*, Atti del II convegno di studio Sassari, 14-16 dicembre 1984 (1985) pp. 149-75, have recently convincingly argued that Cerealis was legate of the proconsul of Africa. As 'patronus perpetuus', Cerealis was clearly patron for life, rather than for the duration of his term of office - a fact attributable, no doubt, to his being a citizen of Lepcis. The omission of his patronate in the later text must, therefore, be due to the same desire for concision which resulted in the omission of the post of legate. Alternatively, it is just possible that we are dealing with two different but closely related senators, as not only are their offices different, but only one (the consularis) bears the signum Curnius.

¹⁵ Ceionius Italicus, patron of Numidia, was also patron of Cirta and Milev (PA2, A259-9a); an anonymous patron of Mauretania Caesariensis was also patron of civitas [N ?]epesinor(um) (PB9, B295). Outside of Africa; cf. M. Bombius Rusticus, patron of Tres Hispaniae and Tarraco (AE (1930) 148), and (Sex. Claudius) Petronius Probus, patron of Venetia-Istria and Verona (D1265, 1266). The latter certainly, and the others quite possibly, were natives or, at least, residents of the client community concerned.

¹⁶ Note, however, that M. Nonius Balbus received dedications both from the commune Cretensium of which he was patron (C10.1430-2), and (presumably simultaneously) from the communities of Cnossus and Gortyna, which fail to describe him as patron (C10.1433-4).

Chapter XI The “Incerti”. The Criteria used for their Inclusion

The total of persons included in the catalogue of ‘patroni incerti’ corresponds approximately to the total of persons whose patronate is deemed secure (330cf. 294). The respective totals of patrocina are also similar (364 cf. 329). The numerical order of the 4 patronal groups is identical for both incerti and certi (viz. group B, A, C, D), although proportionally there is considerable variation. Thus, group (A) incerti numbering only 58, are only about half as numerous as group (A) certi, while the proportions are reversed for group (D), where the incerti (for obvious reasons) are relatively frequent (34 cf. 16). Group (B) incerti are far more numerous than their counterparts in the certi (by 60) whilst group (C) certi and incerti differ only marginally (by 6)¹.

There is a high measure of probability that most of those catalogued as incerti were in fact patrons, although naturally there is some variation according to the criteria used for inclusion. These criteria may be most conveniently discussed within the following categories;

1. lacunary honorific dedications to an individual by the ordo or an unknown dedicand (which may have been the ordo);
2. lacunary or complete honorific dedications to a family member of an individual by the ordo or an unknown dedicand;
3. relationship with a known or suspected patron; and
4. miscellaneous criteria.

Discussion under each heading will also detail the parameters used for exclusion from the incerti. It will be seen, that despite the large number of those included as incerti, the net might have been cast far wider.

¹ A comparative grid drawn up below, provides totals for certi and incerti according to groups. Bracketed numbers give the totals of patrocina. Some of the patrons found in groups A-C of the incerti also appear amongst the certi. Deducting these individuals gives corrected figures of 45,183 and 35 for Groups A,B and C incerti.

(I) **Lacunary dedications by the ordo or an unknown dedicand**
Exactly half of the incerti are included under this criterion (165/330)². Within this category, the majority of incerti (100/165 or 60.61%) are those where the dedicand is unknown. It is impossible to determine with any accuracy what proportion of these incerti were honoured by the ordo, and what by another dedicand (private clients, amici, family members, or freedmen). Dedications to individuals other than by the ordo, rarely attest municipal patronage, and only 11 examples are known for Africa³. Consequently, we must anticipate that a lower ratio of incerti from category 1 will have been patron where the dedicand is unknown, than where the dedicand is known to have been the ordo.

GROUP A

It has already been observed that non-lacunary dedications by the ordo to officials serving in Africa, typically describe the honorand as patron. For group (A) officials, failure to mention the patronate occurs in 21.67% of cases (13/60); for group (C) officials this rate is a high 38.46% (10/26)⁴. In Numidia, where not a single example is known for either legates or other governors, the 6 principal

1. Lacunary dedications by the ordo or an unknown dedicand.

Patrons	Group (A)	Group (B)	Group (C)	Group (D)	Total
Certi	108 (133)	138 (141)	34 (39)	16 (16)	294 ¹ (329)
Incerti	58 (63)	198 (218)	40 (49)	34 (34)	330 (354)
Total	152 ² (196)	321 ³ (351)	69 ⁴ (88)	50 (50)	585 ⁵ (693)

1. The total is diminished by 2, as C63=B80-1 and B96=A238.

2. The total is diminished by 14, as IA2, 6, 7, 12, 14, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 39 and 47 (q.v.) also appear in group (A) certi.

3. The total is diminished by 15, as IB 7, 15, 27, 56, 65, 69, 76, 81, 101, 139, 140, 141, 146, 150, 154 (q.v.) also appear in group (B) certi.

4. The total is diminished by 5, as IC3, 8, 11, 20 and 32 (q.v.) also appear in group (C) certi.

5. The total is diminished by (a) 5, as IB13 = A220, IB66 = C94, IB84A = A248, IC5 = A61, IC14 = A89A. (b) 34 (the sum of numbers 2, 3, and 4 above).

2. There is inevitably some overlap. Some of the incerti appear ² or more texts from the one community, and the criteria for inclusion of these may differ (cf. IA28, IB11, 165 and IC3).

The criteria may also differ where the same incertus appears in different communities (cf. IA 14, 30, 39, 40, 42, 47, IB11, 25, 28, 69, 100, 150, IC7, 8, 11, 21 and 23). An individual may also be classified under two categories of criteria, for example, if he is the honorand of a lacunary dedication by the ordo, and at the same time the son of a known patron from the same community (e.g. IB45). All such examples of double grouping appear at list (E). Percentages given for each category (except D) ought therefore to be taken as approximate only (but to within 5%).

3. Dedications erected by clients to an individual described as municipal patron (B38(1), 219, 232, 274, 295): by family members (B85, 136, 144-5, 187, 298, C285). Note also the odd example of a dedication to a patron, by 'munic[i]pes, liberti et] familia r[ustica?]' (B252A). Three patrons (B222, 268, 269) are honoured by unknown dedicands.

4. All but one of the group (C) 'non patrons' however (NC7), are equestrian. References to Group (A) honorands appear in list (A)1. 'Non-patrons' are NA1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 21 (=C19). Group (C) honorands also appear in list (A) 1. Five who are kin of group (C) officials have been deducted (C63(=80-1), 79, 150-2).

communities appear to have resorted to a policy of automatic co-optation (cf. ch.IV), and one might, with some confidence, consider all those whose patronate is unattested, as (at least) potential patrons of Lambaesis, the Cirtan confederacy, Thamugadi, Cuicul, Verecunda and Diana Veteranorum⁵. Some process of selectivity by at least some communities in Proconsular Africa and Mauretania can, however, be evidenced for the co-optation of officials there, but no geographic or chronological pattern emerges, other than a tendency for more important officials to be co-opted by more important communities. The co-optation of more important officials would also appear to be less random. In Proconsular Africa, for example, proconsuls are recorded as patron far more frequently than any other official, and instances of non-lacunary dedications erected in their honour by the *ordo*, which fail to mention their patronate are quite rare (4)⁶. A ratio of over 3 in 4 (11/17 or 76.48%) of all non-lacunary dedications erected to proconsuls by the *ordo* describe them as patrons, and a similar result emerges for dedications to praesides Tripolitanae, an administrative group also well represented in group (A) (9/11 or 8.82%). If any confidence can be placed in these figures (the total of dedications being comparatively small), a similar proportion of incerti who occupied either of these two posts, and were honoured by the *ordo* in lacunary dedications might also have been designated patrons. In fact, only four examples are known (IA14a, 22, 25 and 26), and these form less than half of all lacunary dedications by the *ordo* to group (A) incerti (4/9)⁷. By far the largest number of group (A) incerti honorands, are those for whom the dedicand is unknown

5. In fact, Numidian legates have, for the purposes of simplification, been treated in exactly the same manner as other group (A) entrants in the incerti. I remain convinced, however, that Numidian legates regularly undertook patronage of Numidia's six major communities either on the assumption of their command, or soon after (see pp.77-8). A large number of Numidian legates and other administrators in the African provinces, who might have been legitimately included in the incerti, have also been rejected. These are the large body of officials who appear on fragmentary dedications in their official capacity. A considerable number of officials do describe themselves as patrons when acting as dedicands (51 patrons in 79 texts for group (A), and 2 patrons in 2 texts for group (C), see list (A) ch.I, but there are sufficient examples of omission in the case of known patrons to make it plain that inclusion of this detail was entirely arbitrary. Although all the examples refer to Numidian legates (22 cf. list (E) ch.IV), extension to other officials presumably applies equally as well. The sheer volume of lacunary dedications by African officials would also render their inclusion unwieldy.

⁶ The number is, however, higher than for any other group of African officials. The examples are C1639, ILA43, C12459 and C6.1736. For references to statues erected by the *ordo* to administrators in Africa where the honorands are not described as patrons, see NA 1-3, 5-6a, 9, 11-15, 21 (=NC19), NC4, 7-8, 10, 16-17, 19 (=NA21), 20A.

⁷ The other 5 are IA20,24,24A,46 and 51. See list A2A.

(30), and these represent over half of all group (A) incerti (30/58)⁸. Proconsuls of Africa and Numidian legates, are particularly well-represented by such dedications (both with 11 examples)⁹, and one must allow that a certain proportion will owe to private, rather than municipal, clients. This is particularly so for Numidian legates, especially when the dedication derives from Lambaesis, and the same is true for the 5 praesides of Mauretania Caesariensis honoured at Caesarea, the third most numerous group of group (A) incerti administrators, honoured by unknown dedicands¹⁰.

For less important officials (other than legates of African proconsuls whose co-optation is relatively frequently documented by group (A) certi and incerti - 8 and 4 examples respectively)¹¹ co-optation normally tended either to coincide when the individual in question was of local origin - as for procurators and curatores rei publicae - or to have been phased out by the early second century - the case for equestrian military officials. Both scenarios can be illustrated by examples from certi and incerti alike.

(1) Procurators

No non-local procurators (with one possible fourth century exception - A171) are attested as patrons in Africa, whereas 3 non-lacunary statues erected to non-local procurators by the ordo, fail to mention their patronate (NA1, NA6, 6a)¹². On the other hand, two procurators have been classified under group (C) certi (C93 and 94) and 5 under group (C) incerti (IC4, 10, 19, 34 and 35). There are also two examples of local procurators (NC4, 20) who were apparently not co-opted. The two procurators listed as certi require some comment. One, M. Rossius Vitulus, while of

⁸ IA8-13, 17-19, 21, 23, 27, 29, 31, 33, 34, 37-45, 50, 53-6.

⁹ proconsuls of Africa - IA 8,9,10,11,12,13,17,19,21,23,27

Numidian legates - IA 29,31,33,34,37,38,39,40,40a,44,45. Other officials (or their relatives) are: praesides Mauretaniae - IA50,53,54,55,56; curatores rei publicae - IA18; praefectus gentis - IA17A; comes [dioe?]cesi Africae - IA24A; grandchildren of a Numidian legate - IA 41,42,43. The 9 officials honoured by lacunary texts erected by the ordo are - proconsuls of Africa: IA14a, 22, 26; Numidian legate - IA46. praeses Tripolitanae - IA25; legate of proconsul of Africa - IA24; praeses Mauretaniae - IA51; curator rei publicae - IA20; comes [dioe?]cesi Africae - IA24A.

¹⁰ See 'Personal Patrocinia' - Lambaesis (n.8-41, 43-52, 54-8), Caesarea (n.74-92) and IA50,53,54,55,56.

¹¹ Legates of proconsuls of Africa (1) group (A)certi - A12,15,28,53,54,121,122,166 (2) group (A) incerti - IA 4,5,16 and 24.

¹² I exclude from discussion procuratores/praesides Mauretaniae, who as the chief provincial executives, fulfilled the rôle in the Mauretanian provinces taken by the proconsul in Africa Proconsularis, and the legate in Numidia.

Italian origin, is described as an *alumnus* of his client *Bulla Regia*, where he evidently settled with his family (C93). The other, *L. Iulius Victor Modianus* (C94), presents some difficulties. Firstly, it is not known whether Thagaste lay within Modianus' administrative sphere as *proc. Auggg.nnn. per Numidiam* and *v.a. proc. tractus Thevestini*, or adjacent to it (cf. H.G.Pflaum, "Carrières", p.268 n.13). Theveste lay some 80 km. south of Thagaste, and the Numidian frontier c55km. to the west of it. In either case, the connection with Thagaste may have been established earlier, as his *patria*, *vicus Maracitanus* (cf. *ibid.*, p.732 and *PIR,I626*) was c120km. to the east. Modianus may have seen earlier military service in the region, and/or formed a bond with the town through marriage and the acquisition of estates.

(2) *Curatores rei publicae*

Only one non-local curator is attested as patron in Africa (A173). Two classified under group (A) *incerti* are of unknown origin, and may have been local (IA18 and 20). By contrast, 12 local *curatores* are listed under group (C) *certi*, and a further 12 or 13 under group (C) *incerti*¹³. As with procurators, co-optation even for local office holders was not automatic. A local curator of senatorial rank, *L. Caecilius Plautius Catullinus* (C11332), and another of equestrian rank, *C. Iulius Maximus* (C23085) both appear to have been passed over, as neither dedication to them - the former by all the *curiae*, the second by the *ordo* - describes them as patron.

(3) *Equestrian military officials*

Three such officials, all of differing rank are known as patrons in Africa. Italian origin is certain for one (*C. Silius Aviola*, military tribune A9-9c) but the origin of the other two cannot be determined. Local origin has been interpreted for *C. Aufustius Macrinus*, patron of Gurza (A24), reading 'Gurzensis' for 'Gurzensis', in the phrase 'C. Aufustius C.f. Gal. Macrinus, praef. fabr. Gurzensis. ex Africa' (cf. *CIL VIII pars V fasc. III* p.256, and B.H. Warmington, p.40 n.17). Although the context is formal - a *tabula patronatus* - the description of Gurza as 'ex Africa' seems

¹³ *Curatores rei publicae* - (1) Group (C) *certi* - C84,112,116,123,147,149,160,161,178,266-7,285,297, (2) Group (C) *incerti* - IC 15,16,21,21a,22,24,25,28,29,30,31,33,37, cf. 26A.

superfluous if Macrinus was a local, and better suits the earlier CIL reading (C69) 'Gurzensic(anes)'. (For Macrinus and for other instances of the term 'ex Africa', see p.59 n.14.). It has been assumed by both J. Nicols, 'Tabulae patronatus', p.544, and P. Romanelli, 'Storia delle province romane dell' Africa', Roma (1959) p.277, that Macrinus served with the third legion in Africa, which would explain the presence of a non-African as patron. The Galeria tribe to which Macrinus belongs certainly indicates descent from a non-African family, if it does not preclude the possibility that the family had settled in Africa a generation or more earlier. The remaining equestrian official of minor rank among group (A) patrons is an anonymous praefectus gentis, co-opted by Oppidum Novum in Mauretania (A278)¹⁴. The date of all three is early; 27-8, 65 and the end of the first century to the beginning of the second, respectively.

¹⁴ cf. P. Leveau, 'L'aile II des Thraces, la tribu des Mazices et les praefecti gentis en Afrique du Nord (À propos d'une inscription nouvelle d'Oppidum Novum et de la pénétration romaine dans la partie orientale des plaines du Chélif', *Ant. Af.*, 7(1973) pp.153-92. For the possibility that the prefect was a local person, or at least somehow personally connected with the tribe, cf. *ib.*, p.191 'le plupart de nos préfets sont des chevaliers qui semblent avoir des fortes attaches dans la région'.

Four equestrian prefects are grouped under group (A) incerti. Serious reservations apply to the co-optation of two of them, praefecti equitum honoured with statues by amici at Sala, Mauretania Tingitana, in the mid-second century (IA48 & 49 - see commentaries). Another prefect from Tingitana, a praefectus cohortis, whose wife was awarded a public funeral and a statue by the ordo of Volubilis (IA 52), offers, perhaps, better prospects, by virtue of his wife's unusual occupancy of the local flamine. The date is again relatively early (109-160). The remaining prefect, a praefectus gentis of an indeterminate date in the first or second century, saw service not in Mauretania, but near Thugga in Africa Proconsularis. He was honoured with a statue by an unknown dedicand, probably either the ordo of Thugga or the gens Nicitisum under his authority. His origin is unknown, and, as for another praefectus gentis, patron of Oppidum Novum in Mauretania (A278 - see above) local origin remains a possibility. The low yield of minor group (A) officials amongst the incerti tends to confirm the impression gained for this same group amongst the certi, viz. one of random and infrequent co-optation, which apparently ceased - or, at least, declined - by the mid-second century. Indeed doubt attaches to five of the six group (A) incerti, classified as minor officials, as to the merit of their inclusion. Two (IA48 and 49), appear only to have been patrons of amici, while three (IA18,20 and 17A), were plausibly of local origin, and hence belong to our group (C) category.

The individuals listed as group (A) incerti do not suggest, either by their office, or their chronology, any substantial alteration to the general picture presented by group (A) certi¹⁵. There are, however, some welcome potential additions to the documented

15 There are only three posts which differ, two of which, praefectus cohortis (IA52) and praefectus equitum (IA48, 49), are comparable to other equestrian prefectures held by known patrons (A9-9c, 24, 178). The other, that of comes [dioe?]cesi Africae (IA24A) became an important military post under Constantine, but our incertus is the only bearer attested in African epigraphy. Group (A) incerti comprise the following officials. The total for each is compared with certi.

proconsul Africae	
(IA1,2,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,14a,15,17,19,21,22,23,26,27)	= 19 (cf 35 certi)
legatus proconsulis Africae (IA 4,5,16,24)	= 4(cf. 8 certi)
praeses Tripolitanae (IA25)	= 1 (cf 11 certi)
legatus leg. Aug. III (IA28,29,30,30a,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,39a,40,40a,40b,44,45,46)	= 16(cf.39 certi)
praeses Numidia (IA47)	= 1(cf. 3 certi)
praeses Mauretaniae (IA50,51,53,54,55,56)	= 5(cf. 8 certi)

11 second century proconsular patrons (a figure considerably down on the first century total of 17). The 6 possible additions are attested on lacunary dedications erected to them by the ordo (IA14a), or by an unknown dedicand (IA12, 13, 17 - cf. St. Gsell's reading of IA13 (ILA1gI282 adn.) '[municipium Kala]m[ensium ?pa]trono'), or by dedications set up to family members by the ordo (IA14,15). For the third century, however, where only 3 proconsular patrons can certainly be documented, there is only one possible supplement from group (A) incerti, the dubious example of C. Octavius Appius Suetrius Sabinus, proconsul under Alexander (IA19). Sabinus is honoured by an unknown dedicand at Histonium, Italy, which is evidently his patria. The dedicand refers to Sabinus as patron, and might be an African community, since Sabinus' cursus is singularly brief, and ends with his occupancy of the African proconsulate (cf. IA19, for examples of African communities honouring patrons in Italy). The dedicand might, however, equally be the community of Histonium, or a private client. Despite the scanty references to third century proconsuls of Africa as patrons, there remains some doubt as to whether this is an accurate reflection of a process of diminishing co-optation, since few of the African texts which mention proconsuls, were honorific texts erected to them by the ordo, or other epigraphic types where municipal patronage was normally given (cf. pp.99-100). It has been argued that children and descendants of non-local administrators were not co-opted in Africa unless they themselves held office there (pp.52-3). The four anomalies included amongst group (A) incerti (a son of a proconsul, IA3, and the three grandchildren of a Numidian legate, IA41, 42 and 43) do not seriously challenge this view, but have been included, in one case, because patronate has been mooted by a modern scholar (erroneously as I believe, cf. IA3), and in the three others, because they are described as patrons by an unknown dedicand

curator rei publicae (IA18,20)

= 2(cf. 1 certi)

praefectus gentis (IA17A)

= 1 (cf. 1 certi).

praefectus equitum (A 48,49)

= 2 (-)

praefectus cohortis (IA52)

= 1(-)

comes [dioe?]cesi Africae (IA24A)

= 1(-)

N.B. (1) For the son of a proconsul, and the 3 grandchildren of a legate classified as group (A) incerti, see below p.247.

(in my view, almost certainly a private client, rather than the ordo, cf. IA41, 42 and 43).

GROUP B. Group (B) patrons may be divided into senators, equestrians, sub-equestrians (a miscellaneous group of important individuals, viz. Carthaginian magistrates (and relatives), provincial priests, in V decurias adlecti, kings, relatives of senators and equestrians, and probable senators and equestrians), and 'Others' (decuriones, flamines, liberti and persons of unknown rank). The distribution of all four groups is proportionally similar between group (B) certi and incerti (see table (A) below), except for the 'others' category (q.v., p.250 below).

Table A	Senators	Equestrians	Sub- Equestrians	Others	Total
Certi	59(61) = 42.75%	25 = 18.12%	25(26) = 18.12%	29 = 21.01%	138 (141)
Incerti	80(95) = 40.41%	50(53) = 25.25%	44(46) = 22.22%	24 = 12.1%	198 (218)
Total	128 (155) = 39.88%	73 (73) = 22.74%	67 (72) = 20.87%	53 = 16.51%	321 (359)

N.B. Bracketed numbers indicate patrocina totals. The total of patrons at the bottom has been corrected to allow for identical individuals amongst group (B) certi and incerti. The total of senators has been reduced by 11, equestrians and sub-equestrians by two each. For references to group (B) patrons (certi and incerti) according to status, see list B.

A large percentage of both group (B) certi and incerti are attested by dedications erected to them by the ordo or by unknown dedicands (who may have been the ordo). For group (B) certi 81/138 or 58.70% are attested by such dedications, which in every case are erected by the ordo. For group (B) incerti, the total is similar. but the

percentage markedly lower (87/198 or 43.94%), if still substantial. Dedications to Group (B) incerti erected by the ordo (42) are only five fewer than those for whom the dedicand is unknown (47) ¹⁶. Distribution according to status group is set out in table (B) below (bracketed numbers again referring to patrocina, where this differs from the total for patrons).

Table B	Senators	Equestrians	Sub-Equestrians	Others	Total
Certi	44(45) = 54.32%	14(17) = 17.28%	13 = 16.05%	10 = 12.35%	81 (85)
Incerti	20 = 47.62%	10 = 23.81%	10 = 23.81%	2 = 4.76%	42
(a) dedicand = ordo				2	47(48)
(b) dedicand unknown	20(21)	16	9		
Incerti Total	39 ¹ (41) = 44.83%	26 = 29.88%	18 ² (19) = 20.69%	4 = 4.60%	87 (90)
Grand Total	80 (86) = 49.08%	39(43) = 23.93%	30 (32) = 18.40%	14 = 8.59%	163 (175)

N.B. The total of patrons at the bottom has been corrected to allow for identical individuals amongst group (B) certi and incerti. The total of senators has been reduced by three, equestrians and sub-equestrians by one each. For references to group (B) patrons (certi and incerti) who are attested by honorific statues, see list C.

¹ The total is 39 not 40 as IB11 is classified under both incerti (a) and (b).

² The total is 18 not 19 as IB150 is classified under both incerti (a) and (b).

For those 42 incerti honoured with statues by the ordo, rather than an unknown dedicand, some estimate of the probability of their patronate is possible, by a comparison of all non-lacunary dedications to individuals by the ordo. The figures for

¹⁶ There is a discrepancy of 2, as 2 patrons appear in both categories (IB11 and 11a and 150 and 150a).

senators and equestrians have already been discussed (pp.111-13), but comparative table (C) for all status groups, given below, illustrates that the ratio of mentioning the patronate of the recipient falls as sharply from the sub-equestrian grouping to the 'Others' category, as from senators to equestrians. Also, the margin of difference between equestrian and sub-equestrian, while superficially similar, widens dramatically when the equestrian group is sub-divided further, according to the division proposed by R. Duthoy (viz. 'equites honorifiques'/'equites fonctionnnels' - cf. p.113 n.14 for a definition). Twice as many 'equites fonctionnnels' are attested as patrons (12 cf. 6), yet 'equites honorifiques' are over twice as numerous on dedications by the ordo, which do not name them as patrons (26 cf.12). The result is, that the ratio of dedications mentioning the patronate of 'equites fonctionnnels' exceeds that for sub-equestrians by over 15% (15.91%), which in turn exceeds that for 'equites honorifiques' by a similar percentage (15.34%). In terms of social status, both the latter groupings differed little from one another, and the difference in the two ratios is probably under that cited, due to the almost certain concealment of 'equites honorifiques' under some of the fathers or sons of equestrians, or some of the individuals entitled *honestae memoriae vir* who have been classified as sub-equestrians.¹⁷ It is clear from table (C) that all male senators among group (B) incerti honoured by the ordo in lacunary dedications stand an excellent chance of having been described as patron. 14 of the 20 senators in this classification are male (the remaining six females may be ascribed a 50% prospect of co-optation (see table (D))). For the 10 incerti equestrians, however, likewise honoured by the ordo, the statistics cited above indicate that eight have a less than one in five chance of being, in fact, patrons, all but two (IB36, 53A) being 'equites honorifiques'. The eight sub-equestrians thus honoured among group (B) incerti probably fared somewhat better. Persons beneath this grouping, the 'Others', have been excluded from entry into the incerti, where they appear as recipients of lacunary dedications erected by the ordo or

¹⁷ The following are all potentially equestrian – B46, father of a *vir egregius*, whose own status is unknown; B100, grandson of an h.m.f.; B101, a *flamen* and h.m.v.; B189, son of an e.v..

an unknown dedicand, unless some other more compelling motive is also at hand. Only four are included. Two are close relatives of known patrons (IB3B is brother of a patron, IB96 a relative, possibly the father of a patron); one (IB89), a *defensor causarum publicarum*, a post occupied by the patron of a nearby town (B75); and the other, appears on a badly fragmented text, where numerous alternative readings (including that of patron); are possible (IB40). The reason for the general exclusion of the 'Others' category from the *incerti* seems warranted by the low ratio of mention of the patronate on honorific dedications to them by the *ordo* 11.63% - see table (C)). The exclusion naturally also applies to dedications erected to their family members, either by the *ordo* or by an unknown dedicand. The table below excludes females, for whom see table (D).

Table (C)
Non-lacunary dedications to individuals of group (B) & (C)* by the
ordo

Status	Patrons	Non-Patrons	Total	% Patrons
Senators	44(62)	5 (6)	49 (68)	89.79 (91.18)
Equestrians	14(18)	31(39)	45(57)	31.11 (31.58)
(a) 'equites fonctionnels'	9(12)	7(12)	16(24)	56.25 (50.00)
(b) 'equites honorifiques'	5(6)	23(26)	28(32)	17.86 (18.75)
Sub-equestrians	13(15)	29(29)	42(44)	30.95 (34.09)
Others	10 (10)	76 (76)	86 (86)	11.63 (11.63)

*Unbracketed figures refer to group (B), bracketed to groups (B) and (C) combined.

N.B. See list D(1) for references to 'equites fonctionnels' and 'equites honorifiques' honoured by the *ordo*.

The exclusion of females from table (C) above, is warranted by (a) the low ratio of patronae to patroni, and (b) the almost exclusive preference for patronae of senatorial status. It has been seen (p.163) that only 13 patronae are known for Africa, of whom

all but one (A257), are senatorial and of certain local origin (group (B) or (C). These 12 form a mere 7.02% of all known group (B) and (C) patrons (12/171), and still only about twice this (14.81%) for all known senatorial group (B) and (C) patrons (12/81). Ten of the twelve senatorial patronae are recorded on dedications to them by the ordo, and two others, from unpublished inscriptions were very probably similarly honoured (C106, B110). Comparison with the extant non-lacunary dedications to *clarissimae feminae/puellae* by the ordo, where patronate is not disclosed, provides an identical figure (10), giving a ratio of mention to non-mention of patronate on such dedications of exactly 50% (10/20). This proportion compares favourably with the ratios given above for sub-equestrians (34.09%) and 'equites honorifiques' (18.75%), and is identical to that for 'equites fonctionnels' (50%), or higher, if allowance is made for the probability that the two patronae on unpublished texts were honoured by the ordo (bringing the ratio to 54.54% - 12/22). There is a dramatic difference, however, for local women of sub-senatorial rank, who are honoured by the ordo. None, with the exception of the probably local Fabia Victoria Iovina, wife of a v.p. *rationalis* (A257), are stated to have been patrons, yet 24 in all were accorded statues with non-lacunary texts by various communities.¹⁸ There is an overwhelming motivation, therefore, for rejecting all sub-senatorial females as potential patrons, even those whose father and/or husband are known to be patrons. Senatorial females, on the other hand, who appear as honorands on lacunary dedications erected either by the ordo or an unknown dedicand, must perforce be included amongst the *incerti*, where they appear to be of local origin. Twelve have been so included, 10 from group (B), and two from group (C), one of whom, IB76, is attested as patron elsewhere, and another three of whom are connected by marriage or birth to known patrons.¹⁹ Senatorial females mentioned on other texts - epitaphs, records of private liberality or

¹⁸ For these 24 females, see (1) group (B) - (NB 74, 80, 87, 91, 113, 115, 116, 121, 127, 128, 140, 141, 147, 157, 172, 174, 182, 184, 195, 197 (2) group (C) - NC 102-4.

¹⁹ IB104A and 160A are wives of known patrons; IC21A is the granddaughter of a known patron. The 12 females included in groups (B) and (C) *incerti* are: IB12A, 59A, 104A, 115A, 119A, 121A, 123A, 123B, 160A, and IC21A, 28A. Two have been included, although their status is not given, viz. IB12A, wife of a senator and IB123B, daughter of a senator. Senatorial status is probable for the former, certain for the latter.

votive offerings etc. – have not, however, been considered for inclusion among the incerti, bearing in mind the low female/male ratio for local senatorial patrons. Similarly, mothers of clarissimi (iuvenes/pueri/puellae), whether or not epigraphically attested (except of course as an honorand), have also been excluded, whereas their fathers (see below, pp.267-8) have not. Table (D) below, gives figures for local females attested as honorands on non-lacunary dedications by the ordo.²⁰

Table (D) Female honorands

Status	Patrons (Group B & C)	Total	Non-Patrons (Group B & C)	Total	Grand Total
Senators	(B) = 6; (C) = 4	10	(B) = 7; (C) = 3	10	20
Sub-senators	(B) or (C)? = 1 (cf. A257)	1?	(B) = 21; (C) = 3	24	24 + 1?
Total	(B) = 6; (C) = 4; (B/C) = 1?	10 (+1?)	(B) = 28; (C) = 6	34	44 + 1?

46 group (B) incerti are honoured with lacunary dedications by unknown dedicands. It is probable that a higher proportion of the dedications to these individuals were erected by the ordo, than for the 30 group (A) incerti, where the dedicand is likewise unknown, although quantification of this variation is impossible. As local (or at least neighbouring) citizens of the community, where the dedication to them is known, group (B) incerti necessarily had a wider range of possible dedicands than group (A) incerti, viz. family and freedmen. There is no indication, however, in any of the dedications to group (B) incerti, that the recipient was deceased, the only circumstance in which a dedication by one family member to another was common. Freedmen, of

²⁰ References to figures

- group (B) patrons -B102 (=240),107,108,113,137,146,240 (=102).
- group (C) patrons -C79,150,151,152.
- group (B) non/patrons
 - (a) senatorial - NB 26, 27, 29, 30, 33, 35, 36
 - (b) sub-senatorial - see n.18(2)
- group (C) non/patrons
 - (a) senatorial - NC28, 38, 39
 - (b) sub-senatorial -see n.18 (2)

course, might honour a patron for any number of reasons while their master was alive, but dedications by them are infrequent in African epigraphy. There are two other alternative dedicands besides the *ordo-amici* and *clientes*. Dedications by the former tend to favour local Africans against administrators (23 cf. 5), but are eclipsed in number by dedications from clients, where the reverse is true (97 cf. 46)²¹. Potential patronate for group (B) *incerti* honoured by unknown dedicands will again be highest amongst the 16 male senators.²² The prospects for entrants in the three other status categories will be highest for those classified as ‘*equites fonctionnels*’ (5 are known - IB21,66,81,105,144) – particularly those known to be patrons in the locale (IB 66 and 81) - and for any others, where an alternative explanation for co-optation presents itself.²³

GROUP (C) Group (C) *incerti* honorands are more numerous where the dedicand is the *ordo*, than where the dedicand is unknown (13 cf. 8 – cf. groups (A) (B) and (D), where the reverse is true-9 cf. 30, 42 cf. 47, 3 cf. 14, respectively). The explanation probably lies in the necessity for specific epigraphic detail in order to classify a patron as group (C), with the consequence that the texts on which they appear are generally less lacunary, and thus more likely to mention the dedicands. One of the 21 group (C) *incerti* honoured with dedications (IC3(2)) is known as patron in the locale, with a consequent enhanced potential for being patron in the community where he is honoured. As a percentage of all group (C) *incerti* honorands, this represents less than 5.00% (1/21), considerably less than the percentage of group (B) *incerti* honorands, for whom an alternative explanation for their potential patronate can be given (19/87 or 21.84%)²⁴.

²¹ See ‘Personal Patrocinia’ n.153-80 (*amici*), n.1-143 (*clientes*).

²² For senators honoured by unknown dedicands and grouped in (B) *incerti*, see list (C)2. All but three are male, viz. 59A, 123A and 160A, while the anonymous honorand 123B, may be either male or female. For a ratio of 50% for the co-optation of *clarissimae* on lacunary dedications, see above, p.251-2.

²³ Viz. patronate in the locale (IB150a), the patronate of a son in the locale (IB100a), the patronate of a brother in the same community (IB3B), and the appearance of a fragmentary phrase, which may refer to the patronate (IB122).

²⁴ These 19 are IB45, 54, 73, 74, 96, 97, 104A, 150 (honoured by the *ordo*), and IB 3B, 76, 81, 100a, 122, 132, 133, 140, 142, 142a, 146, 150a, 160A (honoured by an unknown dedicand). See list (E) for details.

It has already been seen that *curatores rei publicae* are almost equally numerous among group (C) *certi* and *incerti* (see p.244). *Curatores* are, in fact, easily the most prevalent administrators in both group (C) *certi* and *incerti*, representing 12/34 or 35.29% of the former, and 12(or 13)/39 or 30.76% (or 33.33%) of the latter. Recipients of lacunary dedications by the *ordo* among group (C) *incerti* are dominated by *curatores* (8/12 (or 9/13)).²⁵ The frequency rate for local curators honoured by the *ordo* on **non-lacunary** dedications being described as patron is high (8/10), with a consequent high probability that the 8 (or 9) *incerti* honoured on **lacunary** dedications by the *ordo*, were also patrons.

The posts occupied by the four other recipients of lacunary dedications by the *ordo* among group (C) *incerti*, can all be duplicated by group (C) *certi*. Two were procurators (IC4 and 9-10, cf. C 93,94), one a proconsul of Africa (IC23, cf. C168-168a) and the other a legate of a proconsul of Africa (IC26, cf. C78, 82 - 82a,114,155,157). The potential patronage of the latter two is heightened by the fact that a contemporary of the proconsul of Africa, occupied the same post and was patron of the same community, and that the legate of the proconsul is clearly related to a senatorial patron who shared the same nomen (cf. IC23, and 26 for commentary). Speculation concerning the two procurators honoured by the *ordo* is scarcely possible, given the fact that certainty pertains to only four – two who were patrons (C93 and 94), and two who weren't (C10.1684 and ILAlgI3062-3)²⁷.

The posts occupied by the eight recipients honoured by unknown dedicands among group (C) *incerti* vary in only one instance from those recorded for group (C) *incerti*,

²⁵ *Curatores* honoured by the *ordo* - IC16,24,,25,26A?,29,30,31,33,37. Of the four remaining *curatores*, one is honoured by an unknown dedicand (IC 22), and one has a mother who was patron of a community (IC 21; both his mother and his daughter were also honoured by unknown dedicands in another community). The remaining two are included because the wife of one is honoured by the *ordo* (IC15) and the daughter of another by an unknown dedicand (IC28). The probability that these four were also patrons may be regarded as high. The unknown dedicand honouring the curator cited above (IC22) is almost certainly the *ordo* – the corpus of African inscriptions provides only two examples of dedications to a curator by a client (AE (1949) 110 and (1955) 149 cf. (1917-18) 114 in Rome) and none by amici. Fathers, husbands and sons of female patrons, or women singled out for dedications by the *ordo*, were themselves indirectly honoured by such attentions. In combination with local birth and local office in the imperial administration, *curatores* whose family on the female side were thus honoured, were indubitably themselves favoured sons of the community, for whom co-optation would be a fitting tribute.

²⁷ The curious fourth century procurator (A171) is best left out of the discussion.

where the dedicand is known to be the ordo²⁸. The patronate of two procurators honoured by unknown dedicands seems particularly doubtful, dedications to these officials by private clients being over five times as numerous, as dedications by the ordo (36 cf. 7)²⁹. The variant post, that of quaestor provinciae Africae (IC3,ii), is occupied by the patron of a neighbouring community (C48). Neither for group (C) incerti, honoured by lacunary dedications, nor for those included on other grounds, are there any administrative posts not paralleled by group (C) certi. However, proconsuls of Africa and procurators are more numerous for the incerti than the certi (6 cf. 2, and 5 cf. 2 respectively)³⁰. For the former at least (see above for procurators), one may readily imagine that few were not co-opted by their patria, even though certainty exists for only two local proconsuls of Africa as patron. Firstly, two of the group (C) incerti proconsuls are identical to individuals in group (C) certi (IC20 = C105A, IC32 = C168-168a), which redresses the imbalance considerably. Secondly, the very high frequency rate for the co-optation of local senators (91.18%) makes it difficult to believe that such as had attained the highest post in the province would fail to be selected. None of the four proconsuls not described as patrons on honorific dedications by the ordo were African citizens, although there remains the singular and curious case of the clarissimus vir and curator rei publicae from Sufetula (NC7), not so described on a dedication erected to him by all the curiae of his patria (see above, p.244).

GROUP (D) Group (D) incerti are over twice as numerous as those listed as certi (34 cf. 16). Both certi and incerti are predominantly concerned with individuals, whose cursus is incomplete on the text describing them (or possibly describing them) as patron. Moreover, the lacunae in their cursus are irretrievable. In the majority of

²⁸ The 7 with shared posts are: curator rei publicae (IC22) and relatives (IC21A and 28A); procurator (IC 29 and 35); proconsul Africae (IC7); legate of proconsul Africae (IC17).

²⁹ Procurators honoured (a) by private clients - 'Personal Patrocinia' n.59, 61-74, 76-87, 89-97.

(b) by the ordo - C93 and 94; IC 19 and 35; ILAlgI 3062, 3063, C10.1684.

³⁰

proconsules Africae	-	incerti - IC 5,7,14,20,23-23a,32
		certi - C105A, 168 - 168a
procurators	-	incerti - IC 4,10,19,34,35
		certi - C93, 94

cases, those concerned are either anonymous or bear a fragmentary name, and in the remainder, this particular text is the only one by which they are known³¹. In all, only four group (D) certi and 2 group (D) incerti appear with their cursus intact, and their inclusion owes to the fact that they were neither African citizens (or residents), nor administrators in Africa. All were senators, and all date to the first century (BC or AD), 5 of the six antedating AD62 (the other – an incertus, ID2 – is of Vespasianic date). Carthage was the client of one, Uttiedius Afer (D2), and the potential client of two others, both incerti, who are attested there on honorific dedications (ID1 erected by the ordo, ID2 by an unknown dedicand). It may be, that the co-optation of eminent individuals connected with their client neither by origin nor office, was a phenomenon particularly pronounced in the first century (BC and AD), a period notorious for the acquisition of enormous tracts of land in Africa by absentee Italian landlords³². The restriction of much of the evidence to this early period – a period comparatively poorly served by epigraphy in Africa – lends particular force to such an argument³³. One cannot, however, always be certain that Group (A) patrons did not acquire their patronate of African communities prior to serving there in an official capacity. An argument could be made for the jurist Salvian, and a cognate Didius Julianus, both

31 Group (D): anonymous	-	incerti - ID4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22,
		24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34 (=21).
	-	certi - D37, 71, 197, 214, 252, 270
		274, 291, 292, 294 (=10).
Group D bears of	-	incerti ID 3, 8, 9, 17, 20, 23, 26, 32(=8)
fragmentary names	-	certi D281 (=1)
Group D named	-	incerti ID 1*, 2*, 6, 25, 27 = (5)
	-	certi D2*, 13A*, 191, 271*, 280 (=5)

NB. Those asterisked have their cursus intact on the text describing them (or possibly describing them) as patrons. Only one is anonymous (D270), and his name has been restored (Valerius Naso), cf. R. Syme, 'The Roman Revolution', Oxford (1952) p.363.

³² cf. J. Kolendo, 'Les domaines des Caelii en Afrique au 1^e siècle avant notre ère', BACTH, n.s. 19B (1985) pp.53-62; R. Haywood 'Roman Africa', An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome, IV (1959) ed. T. Frank, New Jersey, pp.1-102; P.D.A. Garnsey 'Rome's African Empire under the Principate', 'Imperialism in the Ancient World' (ed. Garnsey P.D.A., Whittaker, C.R.) Cambridge (1978) pp.223-54.

³³ Later examples of patrons of African communities, who were neither administrators, nor it seems local citizens might, perhaps, include C. Iulius Rufinus Laberius Fabianus Pomponius Triarius Erucius Clarus Sosius Priscus, patron of Diana (B235) and M. Num[m]ius [-] Attidi[us -] Tuscus [-], patron of an unknown African town (B76). The youth of both men, the former a salius Collinus, the latter a quae[stor] desig., suggests that the bonds uniting their families to their respective clients were initiated by at least the preceding generation, and for this reason, both are catalogued as group (B) rather than group (D) patrons. On the origins of the Pompeii Sosii, collaterals of C. Julius Rufinus, see M. Corbier, *Tituli V* p.775 and W.C. McDermott 'Stemmata quid faciunt? The Descendants of Frontinus', *Anc. Soc.*, 7 (1976) pp.229-61. For those of C. Julius Rufinus himself, and his forebears the Erucii, see R. Syme, 'The Roman Papers', Oxford (1979) p.489, and M. Leglay, *Tituli V* p.775. For the origins of M. Nummius, see p.59 n.13.

second century proconsular patrons, that their patronate of Pupput (A60) and Bisica Lucana (A67) owed to family connections (and property) in the province, and as such was acquired before their administration³⁴. On the other hand, one proconsul of Africa with holdings near a client community, L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, patron of Gurza (A4), was not co-opted until in office, as a *tabula patronatus* makes clear. There is also the possibility that some of the eminent group (B) patrons (senators and career equestrians), whose local origin is surmised by dedications in Africa to themselves or a family member, were not, in fact, African, but absentee landlords, or persons connected with their client through the nexus of their family or *amici*. Group (B) senators and equestrians of surmised African origin must, at most, conceal only a handful of non-Africans, and, in fact, only two examples cited above (n.33) can be singled out from those catalogued, with a query. It will also be remembered that Fronto, writing in the mid-second century, proffered as prospective patrons of Cirta, only senators linked to the city by origin (or proximate origin) or by marriage. The co-optation of non-Africans other than administrators in the African provinces beyond the first century is unsustained by evidence, and virtually no ambiguous cases exist. The demise, or at least severe decline, in co-opting patrons of this type must obviously be corollary to the rising tide of Africans adlected into the senatorial and equestrian *ordines* from the second century onwards.

The fragmentary nature of many of the texts concerning individuals grouped as group (D) *incerti* is extreme, and, unsurprisingly, these lacunae deprive us of the name of the dedicand of honorific statues for the great majority of those known (14/17)³⁵. In these circumstances, it is not of course possible to hazard a probable percentage of how many of those involved were actually patrons. That the percentage was high, rather than low, is, however, guaranteed by the high proportion of senators amongst group (D) *incerti* (18 as against 3 equestrians, and 13 of uncertain status), and the

³⁴ For a relative of both, Aemilia Clara, as a Hadrumetine, cf. p.62 and n.17, and p.217 n.27.

³⁵ Dedicand = ordo : ID 1,13,22

Dedicand unknown : ID 2,5,6,7,8,10,11,12,18,20,21,24,33,34.

even higher proportion of senators as recipients of honorific dedications³⁶. Twelve of the 17 recipients (or 70.59%) are so attested³⁷. The remaining five comprise two equestrians and three of uncertain status, one of whom, where the ordo is the dedicand, was almost certainly described as '[patr]ono' (ID13)³⁸.

**(2) Lacunary or complete dedications to a family member
(by the ordo or an unknown dedicand)**

This category comprises only 42/330 incerti listed, or 12.73% (cf. the percentage for dedications to individuals themselves, cited above, 50%). For the majority of these (29/42 or 69.05%) the dedicand is known to be the ordo (cf. dedications to the individuals themselves, where the situation is almost exactly reversed, the percentage erected by unknown dedicands being 60.61%). Where the dedications are lacunary, there subsists a good possibility that the husband, father, son etc. of the recipient, was described as patron. This is naturally the case for all of the 13 honoured by unknown dedicands, but there are a further six examples, where the dedicand is the ordo.³⁹ Incerti with family members as honorands range across all groups. As with incerti who are themselves honorands, group (B) is the most prevalent classification, followed by groups A, C and D. The table below provides comparative figures.

³⁶ Senators - ID1**,2*,5*,6*, 7*, 8*, 10*, 11*, 12*, 14, 15, 17, 20*, 22**, 23, 24*, 26, 28.

Equestrians - ID 19,33*,34*

Uncertain status - ID 3,4,9,13**,16,18*,21*,25,27,29,30,31,32

³⁷ All those asterisked above were recipients of honorific dedications. A double asterisk indicates that the dedicand is the ordo.

³⁸ See note above.

³⁹ IB 115, 117, 118, 119, 121, 128.

Table (E) Dedications to family members of incerti

Epigraphic Type	Group (A)	Group (B)	Group (C)	Group (D)	Total
incertus = honorand (ordo = dedicand)	8 32 (33)	38 44 (45)	12 8	3 14	61 98 (100)
incertus = honorand (dedicand unknown)					
Total	40 (41)	80 (83)(A)	20	17	157 (161)
Kin of incertus = honorand (ordo = dedicand)	8	17	4	-	29
Kin of incertus = honorand (dedicand unknown)	4	7	2	1	13
Total	11(B) 12	24	6	1	42
Grand Total	49(C) (53)	104 (107)	25(D) (26)	18	196 (200)

N.B. Bracketed figures represent patrocina.

(A) The total is 80 not 82, as IB11 and 150 are honoured both by the ordo and an unknown dedicand.

(B) The total is 11 not 12, as the wife of IA47 was honoured by the ordo, but his son by an unknown dedicand.

(C) The total is 49 not 51, as IA14 and 40 and their kin, are honorands.

(D) The total is 25 not 26, as IC7 and his wife, are both honorands.

The related honorands of the incerti are in most instances wives (20 examples) and children (11 examples), but there are isolated cases for the mother, brother, grandchildren and even daughter-in-law of incerti⁴⁰. While patrons are sometimes attested on dedications erected by the ordo to their kin - 15 patrons are thus known⁴¹

⁴⁰ Relationship of honorand to incertus:

Wife - IA5,14,18A,16,30a,35,47,52; IB 14,46,59,75a,118,121,123,125,141;
IC 7d,15;ID27.
Children - IA17, 28; IB 70, 78A, 119, 123, 135, 139, 166; IC 21a, 28, 36
Mother - IB 158, 159, 160; IC 8b, 21a
Brother - IB 29
Grandchildren - IA 40b; IB117
Daughter-in-law - IA15
Uncertain - IB75a, 114, 128

⁴¹ The 15 patrons thus attested are A 226a, 226b, 231, 234, 288, 290; B 51, 75, 96, 118, 126, 129, 148, 188, 223 - 4; C 78. The relationship of the honorand to the patron is, as for the incerti, primarily that of wife or child

Wife - A226a, 226b, 231, 234, 290; B51, 126, 148
Children - A 231, 288, 290; B96, 118, 126, 148, 188; C78
Father - B223-4
Uncertain - B75, 129

– it has been seen that omission of an individual's patronate on dedications to their kin need not imply non-co-optation (p.71-2). The example of the dedications by the ordo of Verecunda to two children of a legate (M. Aemilius Macer Saturninus) is decisive on this question, since neither describe the legate (mentioned in both dedications as father) as patron, although another text from the community reveals him as patron in the first year of his command⁴². There seems no reason to differentiate between officials and local citizens on this issue, and we may freely assume that mention of the patronate for the honorand's kin was as arbitrary an addition for the latter, as it was for the former.

Group (A) Of interest are two dedications erected outside of Africa, both to wives of legates of the African proconsul (IA5,15,16), the legate in one case, being the son of the proconsul (IA16). The dedicands are in both instances African communities, the Leptitani (IA5) and the Thabraceni (IA15,16). Dedications by African towns to former officials erected outside of Africa are infrequent - excluding *tabulae patronatus*, only 7 (possibly 8, cf. IA19) are known⁴³. Despite the additional sign of respect involved, there is no indication that those so honoured were more likely to have been patrons. The evidence - admittedly slight - is, if anything, to the contrary, three being mentioned as patrons and four not. One may, therefore, draw no conclusions as to the potentiality of patronate for the husbands (and father-in-law) of the two women under discussion. No other attested family members of African officials were similarly honoured abroad.

There is an enhanced probability that four officials whose kin were honoured either by the ordo (IA14,30a and 35), or an unknown dedicand (IA28), were patrons of the community, as all were patrons elsewhere in the same province.

⁴² Dedications to his sons - C4228-9. Text describing him as patron - C4209 = 1849 and see A230 (and cf. comments IA30a). Similarly, a dedication by the ordo of Cuicul to the wife or son of Flavius Aelius Victorinus (signo) Probatius, p.v., praeses provinciae Numidiae, while incomplete, is unlikely to have described the praeses as patron in any of the lacunae (BACTH, n.s. 17B (1984), 359n.2). He is, however, attested as patron of Cuicul (A257A).

⁴³ African officials honoured abroad - (1) patrons, A50 (Volsinii, Italia), A67 (Roma), A301 (Corduba, Baetica) (2) 'non-patrons' - 1 NA 1 (Puteoli, Italia), NA13 (Capua, Italia), NA15 (Roma) (3) incerti - IA19? (Roma).

Group (B) Almost half (11/24) of group (B) incerti, with kin honoured by either the ordo or an unknown dedicand, are senators, and ipso facto rate an excellent chance of being patrons⁴⁴. This is particularly likely for one, C. Arrius Antoninus (IB141), patron in the locale (B232), and one of the most successful and influential persons of his age. Another four individuals of probable senatorial status (IB14,117,118 and 119), and two 'equites fonctionnels' (IB29 and 46) must also be considered strong contenders for co-optation, none more so than the renowned praetorian prefect, Q. Aemilius Laetus (IB29). Laetus' brother, who may himself have been described as patron, was accorded an equestrian statue by the ordo - a great mark of respect - and praised for his 'adfectio' and 'innocentia'. The remainder comprise four 'equites honorifiques' (IB18A, 70, 106 and 160), a Carthaginian magistrate (IB78A), and two individuals of unknown, but potentially noble status. The prospects of co-optation for these six incerti are necessarily lower, but dedications by the ordo to the kin of lower-status patrons are known. Of the 9 group (B) patrons whose patronate is attested by dedications to a family member, only three are senators (B51,96,223-4), the remainder comprising an 'eques honorifique' (B188), a local II vir (B129), and four persons of no given rank (B75,118,126,148).

Group (C) All six individuals from group (C) with family members as honorands, must be rated as highly probable candidates for co-optation. The interesting case of Ti. Claudius Subatianus Proculus, has been discussed in depth elsewhere (p.71-2 cf. IC36) for the bearing it has on the patterns of co-optation on all Numidian legates. Three of the five who remain were v.c. curatores rei publicae (IC15,21a,28), the other two, the proconsul of Africa, Q. Servilius Pudens and his homonymous son (IC7d and 8b). The high frequency rate of local curatores rei publicae named as patrons on non-lacunary dedications to them by the ordo (80%) has already been discussed, as has the even higher rate for local senators (91.18%). The rate for senatorial curators (6/7 or 85.71%)⁴⁵ lies almost mid-way between the two rates cited. A similar rate can

⁴⁴ The 11 senators are IB13,59,75a,115,121,123,135,139,141,158,159.

⁴⁵ The seven senatorial curators are C84,123,147,149,160 and 161 (all patrons) and NC7 (not described as patron).

presumably be applied to the co-optation prospects of all senatorial curators, and hence to the patronate of our three, known not by dedications to themselves, but to their wives and daughters. This is particularly the case for two (IC21a and 28), where mention of their patronate may have followed in the lacuna after their names and office (curator). For the other (IC15), whose wife is honoured in a dedication not marred by lacunae, there remains the possibility that a twin statue, erected by the ordo to himself, detailed his full cursus and described him as patron. Q. Servilius Pudens, son of the proconsul of Africa of the same name, almost certainly came by his patronate of two African communities, Bisica Lucana (C63) and Calama (B80-81) via his father, and patronate for both seems again highly probable in two other communities; Tuccabor, where the proconsul's wife is honoured by the ordo; and Althiburos, where either father or son was honoured by an unknown dedicand (IC7d and 8b, and IC7 and 8). The patronate of their patria, Hippo Regius, provides one further potential client (IC 7c and 8a, cf. IC1 and 2).

Group D For the problems associated with the one group (D) example, see ID27.

(3) Individuals related to known or suspected patrons

Persons classifiable under groups (A) and (D) are not applicable on the basis of this criterion for consideration as *incerti*. The general exclusion from the patronate of family members of non-local administrators (except where they themselves acted as officials) has been discussed elsewhere (pp.52-3). As the overwhelming majority of group (D) patrons and *incerti* are anonymous, and/or known only by fragmentary texts, family members are simply not known except in isolated cases, and then are either unrecorded in African epigraphy (e.g. D270,280 and ID 1 and 2), too remotely connected for inclusion to be meaningful (e.g. D76), or attested as non-patronal honorands (e.g. D51).

GROUP (B) and (C)

For group (B) *incerti*, as for group (C), all those entered solely on the criterion of relationship with a patron (known or suspected) comply with the following guidelines.

**(1) The person concerned is epigraphically attested in the
African province where their relative was patron**

This proviso is completely arbitrary, and is designed purely to contain the numbers of incerti within a manageable framework. No inference of non-co-optation is intended for family members attested either epigraphically beyond their native province, or from literary sources. Infringement of the proviso occurs on twelve occasions. All but four concern individuals who were fathers of immature patrons (IB55 and 114, the fathers of 1 and 3 clarissimi pueri respectively, all patrons), or fathers and/or husbands of patronae (IB64,78 and 111 - fathers; IB28,75 and 112 - husbands). A very strong case exists for tracing patronate back to the father and/or husband of children and females, as has been argued on pp.164 ff. and pp.184 ff. The remaining four instances similarly carry strong implications of patronate for the relative concerned. The relative (IB134) is in one example the father of a patron, but also quite probably the son and nephew of patrons, both of whom are attested by lacunary dedications. The family was one of particular lustre, our incertus being the nephew of Africa's first consul. The relative in a second instance is both the son and elder brother of patrons from Uzappa (Anicius Faustus Paulinus, IB67A), and in another, the son of this incertus (M. Cocceius Anicius Faustus Flavianus, IB84A), whose own younger brother was proconsul of Africa, and potentially patron of both Uzappa (IC23a) and Thubursicu Bure (IC23). Finally, there is the case of Q. Servilius Pudens (IC2), whose homonymous father was legate of the proconsul of Africa, and potentially patron of his patria, Hippo Regius (IC1). The son and grandson of Q. Servilius Pudens filius, also bear the same tria nomina. The former was proconsul of Africa (IC7), the latter, patron of two African communities (C63 and B80-81 cf. IC8). Both are epigraphically attested in Africa, and as grandson and great grandson of a potential 'patronus patriae', may themselves have assumed the same title, which must likewise be inferred for our incertus (IC2). There were, therefore, hypothetically, four generations of Q. Servilii Pudentes, patrons in unbroken succession of their patria, even though certainty cannot accrue to any one of them.

(2) The patron is father of the incertus/a.

This group embodies the largest proportion of incerti, whose inclusion rests on relationship with a patron (40/67 or 59.70%). Of these 67, 32/55 or 58.18% are from group (B), 8/12 or 66.66% are from group (C). There is prolific evidence from all the African provinces for the co-optation of patron's children (cf. pp.184 ff.). The fathers represent all four social groups (senators, equestrians, sub-equestrians and 'others'), the children all but the lowest social group for boys, and only the senatorial order for girls. Patron's daughters beneath senatorial status, who are not themselves described as patrons, have consequently been excluded from the incerti (see also pp. 251-2 above). In fact, the only patron's daughters of senatorial rank known to us are all patronae. Three clarissimae puellae, whose fathers may have been patrons, are listed in the incerti (IB123B, IC21A and 28A cf. IB115B), but as all were honorands on lacunary dedications, they are rather entered on this criterion, since it is this which forms the basis for the presumption of their father's potential patronate. All the 40 children of patrons, entered as incerti solely or primarily on this basis, are therefore male. Although the African evidence suggests that a process of selectivity affected all four social groups, and that it discriminated mostly to the disadvantage of those below senatorial ranking, there is no unambiguous example of any patron's son (as opposed to daughter) having been specifically passed over (see pp.186 ff.). Patron's sons of all social groupings are therefore admitted as incerti. For the 17 who were senatorial,⁴⁶ the ratio of those co-opted was presumably not less than the co-optation ratio for senators as a whole (91.18% on the estimate of honorific statues mentioning or failing to mention their patronate - see pp. 251-2). If the ratio for sub-senatorial patronal sons likewise approximated that for sub-senatorial social groups as a whole - a less certain proposition - the relatively low status of the 23 concerned does not augur particularly well in their favour. The only equestrian example (IB160) is an 'eques honorifique', and the remainder are equally divided between sub-equestrians and

⁴⁶ Senators: IB55,65,67A,69b,83,84A,101,143,151,158,159,166 IC2,8,11,18,23a

'others', with 11 apiece⁴⁷. For 14 of the incerti with fathers as patrons, there are some additional grounds for believing that they were themselves co-opted. Twelve of the 14 are senators, and the other two of unknown status, although one has a clarissimus iuvenis as brother (IB84).⁴⁸ The latter appears to be described as patron in the text ('pa[tronus]?'). Eight of the others were either patrons in the locale (IB69b, IC8,11 and 23a?), or had relations who were (IB55, his son; IB143a, his wife; IB151, his father; IC2, his grandson). Another (IB65), is most probably identical to, or at least brother of, a known patron (B92), while a second, may have been described as patron in a lacunary dedication in his honour (IB45). Of the three who remain, the (younger) brother of one was patron (IB67A) and the brothers of the others possible so (IB83 and 84A).

(3) The patron is mother of the incertus/a.

The basis for inclusion is clearly identical to that given above for incerti, whose fathers were patrons. The incerti included on these grounds number 3 (IB79A,113,IC21). All are senators, and the fathers of all were almost certainly patrons as well. The three sons comprise a representative of the Aradii (IB79A) - a family for whom the patronate appears to have been a virtual birthright (see p.200) - a collateral of the Aradii (IB113) and a fellow townsman (IC21). The patronate of all three may be regarded as probable in the extreme.

(4) The patron is grandfather (or great-grandfather) of the incertus/a.

This group is again small - only 5 individuals being entered on this basis (IB56,152,IC7c and 11a being grandchildren, and IC8a a great-grandson). The grounds for inclusion are naturally premised on the probability that their fathers (and in one instance (IC8a), grandfather as well) were patrons. The high probability of their patronate may be gauged by the fact that all were senators, and that three were

⁴⁷ Sub-equestrians: IB3,3A,45,56A,78,84,167,168 IC12,13,38.

'Others': IB1,2,2A,19,41,42,47,50A,154,169,170.

⁴⁸ The 12 senators are IB55,65,67A,69b,83,84A,143a,151; IC2,8,11,23a. The other 2 are IB45 and 84.

patrons in the locale (IB56, IC8a and 11a), while another was father of one of the above, and proconsul of Africa (IC7c, father of IC8a).

(5) The patron is wife of the incertus.

In the 6/13 instances where patronae are not attested as either the spouse and/or daughter of patrons, the presumption that they were so, must invariably be correct (see pp. 164 ff. for this, and the one possible (imperial) exception). All the incerti entered as husbands of patronae, were, like their spouses, senatorial in status, and comprise two Aradii (B79 and C106, the latter a patron in the locale) and four members of other illustrious houses (IB28 (= 143), 75, 77 and 112). Detailed analysis appears on pp. 171-8 and in the respective references to each of the six incerti.

(6) The patron is daughter of the incertus.

See (5) above. The three incerti fathers (IB64, 103 and 111), of whom two are senators, and one (IB111) almost certainly so, are discussed at length on pp. 174-6 and in the respective references to the three.

(7) The patron is son of the incertus.

The prerequisite - complied with in all ten cases⁴⁹ - for incerti entered under this heading, is that their son be beneath the age of 25 at the time patronate is attested. Patrons of immature years almost certainly derived their patronate from that of their father (see pp. 181-2). There is, however, one instance of a procurator's son, old enough to have attained the flaminiate, but probably still in his twenties, to judge by his filiation (his father's name being given in full), whose father was not apparently patron (C247 cf. p. 182). Six of the ten incerti whose sons were patrons were senators, of whom four were fathers of one or more clarissimi pueri, another, father of a salius Collinus (and ipso facto younger than 25), and the last, father of a boy or youth who describes himself as 'procos. filius'.⁵⁰ Two of the four remaining incerti, whilst equestrians themselves, were fathers of young senatorial patrons, a clarissimus

⁴⁹ IB55a, 58, 98, 100, 108, 109, 114, 116, 147 - 147a; IC 7a-b

⁵⁰ Fathers of c.p. - IB55a, 109 (one), IB58 (two), IB114 (three)

Father of salius Collinus - IB147-147a

Father of procos. filius - IC7 - 7a

puer in one example (IB98) and a clarissimus puer or iuvenis in the other (IB100). The patronate of all those thus encountered may be assumed with some confidence. For those two not yet discussed, the potentiality of their patronate is less assured, in part because of their status - one (IB108), being an 'eques honorifique', the other (IB116), a II viriliculus - but primarily because the youth of the sons involved is predicated only on the fact that they bear filiation, with their father's name in full, a guide which is neither infallible, nor specific. In association with a post, as in one instance (the one of IB108, the a militiis, B135), the son must be at the earliest in his young twenties, and may thus have been co-opted in his own right.

(8) The patron bears some other relationship to the incertus/a.

In three of the cases so far discussed (criteria 5-7), where an incertus has been entered on the grounds of a close family connection with a known patron, the patron, either by virtue of their gender or immaturity, fell under the authority of the incertus concerned. The subordinate position of the patrons on a family level supplies credence to the possibility that these incerti were themselves already co-opted. In another three cases, the position is reversed, and the patronate of the incertus is presumed by the well-attested phenomenon of children, and even grandchildren, successively entering upon the patronate themselves (criteria 2-4). With other family members, the degree of dependence upon, or authority over, one of their kin who was patron, is diminished, with appropriate consequences for the potentiality of their own patronate. Co-optation of other family members is attested, particularly so in the case of siblings, but even here (except when their father was also patron), it may be assumed that communities were under less obligation to extend the patronate and allow it to become automatically a family fief. The case of L. Marcius Simplex (B58), honoured like his father and brother with dedications by the ordo of Thugga, but alone described as patron, has already been examined (p.72). It is impossible to know to what extent this case was typical, but it is unlikely to have been an isolated occurrence, at least for persons like the Marcii, all of sub-senatorial status.

Individuals connected to patrons by a relationship other than those cited above (viz. as parent, wife, child or grandchild) are considered for inclusion, only where other circumstantial evidence suggests the possibility of their patronate. Where this evidence takes the form of a lacunary honorific dedication to the individual concerned, such individuals are entered into the *incerti* rather on that account, than on the ground of being, for example, sibling or grandparent of a patron.⁵¹ Otherwise, the inclusion of family members of patrons not so far discussed, appears here. Five people are concerned. Three were grandparents of a patron, the patron being grandson in two instances (cf. IB15a-b and 27) and granddaughter in the other (cf. IB104). Two were connected to patrons through the marriage of their children, the patrons being a daughter-in-law (cf. IB25), as well as a son-in-law (cf. IC14).

In the latter case, the son-in-law, while not actually attested as patron, can so be anticipated, both his father and younger brother being *patroni patriae* (see IB67A and p.264 above, for Anicius Faustus Paulinus). His father-in-law, Sex. Cocceius Vibianus (but cf. M. Christol, 'À propos des Anicii. Le III^es,' *MEFR*,96 (1986) 149-64, who disputes the connection), was patron in Africa whilst proconsul, but in a community considerably removed from the domicile of his (purported) son-in-law at Uzappa (Turris Tamalleni, cf. A89A). If no obvious connection exists between his patronate there, and his proposed patronate of Uzappa, the fact that, (a) proconsuls were still co-opted in Africa at this date (a fact for which there is little other evidence) and that (b) his daughter was conceivably espoused to (or perhaps already residing with) her husband near Uzappa during Cocceius' proconsulate, provided Uzappa with both example and cogent inducement to follow suit. For the four remaining *incerti*, the suggestion that they were patrons - other than their connection to known patrons - depends upon less complex circumstances. Two were patrons in the locale (IB15a-b and 27), where their grandsons are attested as patron, the son of one being also patron in the locale (IB15a-b). Another, Q. Antistius Adventus Postumius Aquilinus, whose

⁵¹ Examples of this occur where a patron is brother of the honorand (IB6 and (perhaps) 38), grandson (IB132), great-uncle (IB133), daughter-in-law (IB142a) and of indeterminate connection (IB96 and 97).

daughter-in-law (Vibia Aurelia Sabina B102 and 240 cf. p.167) was patron of two communities (Thibilis and Calama), was prospectively patron of one (Thibilis), where he is known as honorand on a lacunary dedication (IB142), as well as of neighbouring Cirta (IB142a). His patronate of a third community, the client of his daughter-in-law (Calama), may, therefore, be premised on the probable assumption that the estates here (18 km. from the principle residence at Thibilis) date back to Adventus, whose stature and wealth made co-optation a natural choice for communities within the orbit of his domain. Finally, Ti. Aradi[us Saturninus ?], whose granddaughter is known as patron of Bulla Regia, indubitably held the same title, his son being a mere clarissimus iuuenis at the time his granddaughter's co-optation is recorded. His son, as well as his granddaughter - who was certainly less than 10, and, perhaps, only an infant - were clearly still under his potestas at this juncture.

(4) Miscellaneous criteria for inclusion of incerti.

Incerti entered under this final heading form a quite substantial proportion of all incerti listed 68/330 or 20.61%. The majority of these (41/68 or 60.30%) concern particularly fragmentary texts, from which it is unclear (a) whether the person concerned is honorand or dedicand of a dedication (20 examples - 15 from group (B), one from group (C), and four from group (D)) or (b) whether the person is being described as municipal patron, patron of a client, or - in some cases, where the suspected word 'patronus' is mutilated - even as patron at all (21 examples - three from group (A), eight from group (B) and ten from group (D)).⁵² No other type of criterion under the the heading 'miscellaneous' occurs with anything like this frequency, and there are few instances, where such criteria involve incerti from more than one group. For this reason, discussion of miscellaneous criteria will proceed group by group.

⁵² Incertus is dedicand or honorand : IB9,10,32,35,37,39,43,49,93,94,126,145,161,165(2),171; IC34; ID9,14,17,23.

Incertus appears to be described as municipal patron: IB12,124,130,156,163,164,164A,165(1); ID,3,4,16,19,26,28,29,30,31,32.

GROUP A

Twelve group (A) incerti are included on the basis of seven miscellaneous criteria.

(1) Two equestrian calvary prefects (IA48,49) were honoured by amici at Sala, Mauretania Tingitana, one as patron. It has been argued (contra Harmand) that co-optation can be precluded for both individuals.

(2) Two individuals may have been described as patron. For one (IA30), the fragment 'p[-]' after the name of a legate and his office, may have read 'p[at(ronus) col(oniae)]'. For another (IA3), the Punic word MRN had been taken by G. Ch. Picard to read 'patronus', and the patronate of the mizrah equated with patronate of the community. The mizrah were not, however, the local senate, but - as analogy with other neo-Punic texts confirms - societies of worshippers attached to a particular god, a view which Mr. Picard has himself most recently come to espouse ('Le Temple de Hoter Miskar à Mactar', *BACTH*, n.s.18B (1988) p.24). Serg. Rubellius Plautus, and his father C. Rubellius Blandus (IA2), whose patronate had been predicated on that of his son, may now be rejected as patrons of Mactaris.

(3) A proconsul's son is honoured 'pro [ami]citia quae eis [cum] patre est.' The equation of amicitia with patronage has been considered unlikely (cf. IA1).⁵³

(4) Two Numidian legates (IA28 (1) and 32) have been tentatively described as patrons by the respective editors of the texts, H. Doisy and S. Tournenc. Both texts are extremely fragmentary, and no trace of the expression 'patronus coloniae' (or a similar phrase) has survived. Given their command, patronate is in both cases highly probable, but this cannot be confirmed by the texts in question.

(5) A legate of a proconsul of Africa may have been described as patron in a lacuna. The legate's patronate is highly probable, as (a) the text derives from Lepcis Magna, where numerous proconsuls and legates are known as patrons, and (b) the proconsul, who with the legate dedicates the text, is described as patron (IA4).

⁵³ Note also the specific distinction on a tabula patronatus from Rome (but referring to an African community), 'hospitium amicitiamque fecit' (A164).

(6) A proconsul of Africa and his legate may both have been described as patrons in textual lacunae. The text, the dedication of an arch at Sabratha, may be compared to an apparently almost identical dedication of an arch by the pair at neighbouring Lepcis Magna, where both are described as patrons (IA 6 and 7).

(7) A Numidian legate honoured as patron of the Cirtan confederacy by a small satellite community (Sigus) may also have been patron of this community, perhaps attributed into his clientela.

N.B. Two potential additions to group (A) incerti, both pre-eminent republican figures, have been mooted by P. MacKendrick (op. cit., p.45) and J. F. Gardner ('Caesar, The Civil War', Penguin, 1976 p.300 n.5). They are respectively, M. Aemilius Lepidus (patron of Uthina?) and Gaius Marius (patron of the Numidii and Gaetuli?). The evidence for the former, already known as patron of Thabraca (A3), rests on no firmer ground than the antiquity of Uthina's settlement - a Roman colony was established there by veterans of the thirteenth legion soon after the battle of Actium (cf. CIL VIII p.2427) and suggests an earlier Roman presence at the site. The proposed patronage of Marius in Africa relies on a passage from the *Bellum Africanum* (32-13-17) in which it is stated that the Numidii and Gaetuli, having experienced the 'beneficium' of Marius, proffered their support to his nephew Caesar. The assumption that anything as formal as a contract of patronage was drawn up between both parties seems unlikely. Africa offers only one other parallel of a patron of an African tribe, that of T. Caesernius Statius Quinct(ius) Macedo, patron of the gens Mauror(um) Maccuum in AD 107 (A273). The evidence for both men has been deemed too circumstantial to warrant their inclusion in the incerti, and the case for their patronate is best left open.

Group B

Twenty nine group (B) incerti are included on the basis of five miscellaneous criteria.

(1) Fifteen individuals were either honorands or dedicands on fragmentary texts. None are described as being of senatorial status, with the possible exception of one of three incerti of imprecise status (IB93 cf. 94 and 165 (1)). The remainder mostly

comprise equestrians - 3 'fonctionnels' (IB37,39,49), and 6 'honorifiques' (IB9,10,32,43,126 and 161) - but there are two others grouped as sub-equestrians (IB35 and 145).

(2) Four prominent individuals, two senators (IB11(2) and 120), the husband (?) of a clarissima femina (IB 155), and a praetorian prefect (IB5), all occur on fragmentary dedications erected by them. In every instance, lacunae appear after their name or cursus, wherein mention of municipal patronage may have occurred.

(3) A senator, recorded as patron of Thugga, appears as a benefactor in two neighbouring communities (IB7 and 7a). Both the texts are fragmentary, and may well have added the detail of patron.

(4) A local consul is attested at Thugga by an as yet unpublished inscription (IB88). A considerable body of texts concerning prominent Africans or officials in Africa still remain to be published⁵⁴. There is a possibility that some of these concern patrons, but where no additional information exists, relating either to the person involved or to the nature of the text, they have, faute de mieux, had to be disregarded. The consul from Thugga, while excluded by C. Poinssot from his catalogue of Thuggan patrons

⁵⁴ Prominent persons (other than local magistrates) from unpublished African texts not included in the list of incerti are:

- (1) L. Septimius Civica, v.p. (Lepcis Magna), cf. M. Torelli 'Per una storia della classe dirigente di Leptis Magna', RAL 28 (1974) p.388 n.18 (Lepcis Magna)', RAL, 28 (1974) p.388 n.18
- (2) Q. Manlius Crestus, proc. (Lepcis Magna) ib. .p.392 n.30.
- (3) Q. Antonius Saturninus, clarissimae memoriae puer (Lepcis Magna) ib., p.399 n.16.
- (4) Granius (signo) Imuschius, consularis (Lepcis Magna) Tituli Vp.722.
- (5) Aquilia Blaesilla, c.f. (Lepcis Magna) Tituli IV p.464.
- (6) Haterianus (senator?) (Lepcis Magna) Tituli V p.723.
- (7) Aemilia Tertulla Marciana Cornelia Rufina Africaniana, c.f. (Aptuc (-)) ib., V p.709.
- (8) Aemilia Marciana [-] Pietas, c.f. (Aptuc (-)) ib.
- (9) Publilius Caeionius Caecina Albinus, sex fascalis Numidia (Bagai) M. Leglay, 'Épigraphie et organisation des provinces africaines', Atti del terzo congresso int. di epig. greca e latina, Roma, 1959 p.237.
- (10) M. Aurelius Decimus, v.p. praeses Numidia, (Lambaesis) ib., pp. 236-7.
- (11) Ti. Claudius Subatianus Proculus, leg. Aug. pr. pr. (Lambaesis) ib., p.236.
- (12) P. Flavius Pudens Pomponianus, c.v. (Thamugadi) Tituli V p.772.
- (13) Q. Lollius Saturninus, eq. pub. exorn. (Bulla Regia) R. Duncan-Jones, 'Equestrian Rank in the Cities of the African Provinces under the Principate : an Epigraphic Survey', PBSR, 25 (1967) p.173 n.100.
- (14) Ti. Arad[ius -], c.v. (Bulla Regia) Tituli V p.713 n.1
- (15) Q. Aradi[us-Ae]lian[us-] (Bulla Regia) ib., n.2
- (16) anon; senator, curator rei publicae (Lepti Minus) F. Jacques, 'Les curateurs des cités africaines au III^e siècle,' ANRW, X,2 (1982) p.134 (cf. 'Le privilège de liberté', Roma, 1984 p.242 n.13).
- (17) Ti. Plautius Felix Ferruntianus, proc. (Mactaris) G.C. Picard, 'Un témoignage sur le commerce des objets d'art dans l'empire romain. La statue de bronze d'Apollon de Maktar offerte par S. Iulius Possessor', R.A.,2 (1968) , pp.297-314.
- (18) Iulius Sestillus, proc. Maur. Caes. (?) H.G. Pflaum, 'Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut - Empire romain, supplément', Paris, 1982, p.144.

(op. cit.), is known to have been honoured by the ordo with a statue. As so few (5) non-lacunary honorific dedications to (male) senators fail to describe the honorand as patron, there is an excellent chance that the text is lacunary. Poinssot's proposal that the consul was instrumental in engineering Thugga's promotion from municipium to colonia (ib., p.238 n.85), would, if correct, provide a compelling motivation for considering him as a patron.

(5) Finally, eight individuals are known from fragmentary texts, in which a lacunary phrase may have corresponded to 'patronus coloniae' or something similar. They comprise only one senator (IB124) and one 'eques fonctionnel' (IB163), the remainder being either 'equites honorifiques' (IB156,164,164A) or 'others' (IB12 - a flamen, and IB130 and 165 - persons of no given status). All the fragmentary phrases may be extended to parallel those applied to known patrons. They comprise

- IB12 : 'cur.[et pat.?] civitatis suae'
- IB124: 'cive [et patrono? Ka]rthaginis'
- IB130 'patr[onus?] patriae'
- IB156 '[pa]trono' (of the ordo or a client?)
- IB163 'patroni [coloniae]' or 'patron(o) i[ncomparabili?]'
- IB164 " " " " " " "
- IB164A " " " " " " "
- IB165 'Volubilitani patr(ono?)'

These examples may be compared to another six group (B) incerti, for whom similar fragmentary phrases are recorded, but who have also been included on other criteria, five as honorands (three by the ordo - IB54, 73 and 74, two by an unknown dedicand - IB87 and 122) and one as the brother of an honorand (IB84 - the dedicand is the ordo). The status group, as indeed the potentiality for co-optation, is markedly high for four of these six, three of whom were senators (IB54,73 and 74), and another of unknown status, but the brother of a senator (IB84). The phrases, which appear to be testimonials to their patronate, are in order -

IB54 'civi et [patrono coloniae]'

IB73 '[civib(us) et patronis?] bon[is, mun.?] Thugga'

IB74 " " " " " "

IB84 'pa[troni col.?]'

IB87 '[patrono?] splendidissimae col. Thugg.'

IB122 '[patrono?] splendidissimi mu[nicipii]'

GROUP C

Seven group (C) incerti are included on the basis of six miscellaneous criteria.

(1) A quaestor provinciae Africae is honoured by numerous amici at Hadrumetum (IC27). Inference of municipal patronage from such evidence is unreliable (see comments to IA48 and 49).

(2) The incertus is either an honorand or dedicand (IC34, an anonymous procurator).

(3) The legate of a proconsul Africae has been described as patron of Hippo Regius by E. Marec, editor of the text. The text is lacunary, and no letters (or fragments of letters) survive of the word '[patroni (municipii)]'. One should note, however, that the proconsul mentioned on the same text is described as patron, and that he appears on a text from Lepcis Magna, where both he and another legate are recorded as patrons (A27a and 28). A proconsul and his legate are also known as patrons of Hippo Regius, on an earlier text (A14a and 15). Two other criteria involve a proconsul of Africa and his legate.

(4) In an instance similar to that above (and cf. IA4), a text describes a legate as patron, whilst the proconsul, a co-dedicand of the inscription, was indubitably named patron in the lacuna after his title 'c.v.' (IC32).

(5) A proconsul and his legate from Lepcis Magna, both citizens of the community and related to one another (the future emperor L. Septimius Severus and his uncle), appear as dedicands of a text commemorating the benefaction of a local dignitary. The context is one where omission of the patronate need not imply non-co-optation (see p.68).

(6) A former quaestor provinciae Africae, is described as patronus coloniae by the small civitas of Thibiuca (IC3). Thibiuca, lying only 7 km. from the colonia to which the text presumably refers (Thuburbo Minus), was perhaps attributed to the patron's clientela, by virtue of its satellite status (cf. IA39a).

GROUP (D)

Sixteen group (D) incerti are included on the basis of four miscellaneous criteria.

(1) Four incerti were either honorands or dedicands (ID9,14,17,23), at least three of whom (ID14,17,23) were senators.

(2) Ten incerti appear in fragmentary texts, wherein lacunary phrases may have read 'patronus coloniae' etc. The texts are in fact, fragmentary in the extreme, the status of only one individual (a consul - ID28) allowing for any certitude. Little real confidence can also be placed in any of the fragmentary phrases, where patronate may have been mentioned. These are -

ID3 - '[patron?]um, mun[icipii]' (particularly doubtful)

ID4 - '[pa]tro[n-]'

ID16 - '[pat]rono[-]'

ID19 - 'patro[-]'

ID26 - '[leg. Aug. pr. pr. pat.?] col. dedic[avit]'

ID28 - '[patr.? co]l. cos. d[es.? -]'

ID29 - '[patron]us? c[ol.?-]'

ID30 - 'pat[ron. col.?]'

ID31 - '[patr]onus? [col.?]'

ID32 - 'patr[on. col.?]'

A far more promising candidate is the anonymous honorand (entered under this criterion), whom the community of Segermes described as '[patr]ono?', or (less probably) as '[civi b]ono' (ID13).

(3) Private clients honour an anonymous senator at Rome with a dedication. This mark of respect by a small group of clients ('[L]epcimagnenses cli[entes]') possibly reflects municipal patronage, but cf. IA 48 and 49 and IC27.

(4) Finally, there is the interesting case of the equestrian statue to a certain Marcus Antonius Rufus, which an eighteenth century traveller records (as well as its destruction by 'iconoclasts' (ID25)).



Bulla Regia - Baths provided by [Iul]ia Memmia [Pris]ca?
Ru[-] Aemil[iana] Fidiana, c.f., patron of Bulla Regia
(C79).

Chapter XII

Beneficia et Merita

(A) The Evidence of Dedications Erected to Patrons by the Ordo

Dedications to patrons by the ordo are the most common epigraphic type attesting patronage in Africa (157 texts concerning 149 patrons) yet well over half of our sample (83 texts concerning 83 patrons) withhold any intimation as to the cause of their erection¹. The bias towards this rather irritating reticence is at its most extreme in the early empire. Outside of Mauretania, the earliest dedications to define a patron other than by name and cursus are all C2 (seven examples) or C1 - C2 (one example), and of the four where some precision in dating is possible, none predate 166-9². In Africa Proconsularis, dedications by the ordo expressing some form of gratitude to a patron, non-existent in the C1³ comprise about 1/4 of all dedications by the ordo to patrons in the C2 (7/30)⁴ and about 2/5 in the C3 (19/49)⁵. In Numidia, dedications expressing gratitude do not emerge until the early C3, where they again number about 1/3 of all dedications by the ordo (4/11 cf. 0/10 for the C2⁶ - no patrons are known for the C1). By the reign of Diocletian, however, the victory of volubility, presaged in the late C3, is complete, and all 30 dedications from Africa Proconsularis (and the new provinces carved from it), together with two Numidian dedications for the Dominate, declare enthusiastically the merita of the recipient⁷. Dedications by Mauretanian ordines to

¹ See list (C) chapter 1, under headings 3 and 4 for references.

² C2 - A61, B57(1-2), 58, 72, 73, 74; C1 - C2. Datable are B57 i-ii, 58 (AD 166-9), and A61 (AD 174).

³ The number of C1 dedications by the ordo to patrons is, however, very low - 6 (cf. A3, B22(2), 33, D2, 13A, 270) in relation to the total of C1 patrons known - 39 (cf. A3-6, 9-12, 14-15, 18, 21, 23-30, 34-35, 272, B1, 7, 13, 16-17, 19-20, 22, 31-33, 36, 268-9, D13A, 270-271).

⁴ Seven C2 dedications expressing gratitude - see n.2. 23 C2 dedications not expressing gratitude - cf. A43, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 60, 67, B39 (1-2), 40(1), 42, 47, 55, 56, 64-5, 66, 70, 76, 77, C48, 63, D71.

⁵ 19 C3 dedications expressing gratitude - A109, 119, B86, 91(1-2), 101, 105, 113, 115, 117, 137, 141, 154, C79, 93, 112, 116, 123, 147.30 C3 dedications not expressing gratitude - cf. A89A, B80-1, 83, 87, 88, 89, 92, 95, 97-8, 102, 103, 104, 106A, 107, 108?, 111, 134, 135, 138, (& 139,140), 142, 143, 146, 153, C82, 82a, 84, 94, 114, 149, (& 150, 151, 152), 155.

⁶ 4 C3 dedications expressing gratitude - A242, B235, 240, 241. 7 C3 dedications not expressing gratitude - cf. A249, B236, 245, C243, 243a, 244, 247. 10 C2 dedications not expressing gratitude - cf. A207, 208, 211, 217a, 226a(2), 233a, 234a, B213, 215-6.

N.B. For dedications of an indeterminate C2-C3 date in Africa Proconsularis (none are so dated for Numidia), only one (B128) in six expresses gratitude (the other 5 are B124, 125, 127, 131, 132).

⁷ 31 dedications post 283 expressing gratitude - A156, 158, 159, 163, 165, 175, 176, 176a, 180, 182, 182a, 183, 194, 195, 196, 198, 201, 204, B184-5, 199, 200, 202, 205, C157, 161, 168, 168a, 174, D191 (Africa Proconsularis), A259, 259a (Numidia). An almost certain addition is A181 - 'praestantissimo'

patrons are far fewer, and are restricted to the Principate. Of the six known, the majority (4) do, in fact, employ some term or expression of gratitude, but in three of the four examples, this merely reduces itself to an appreciative adjective - 'innocentissimo' (A273), 'incomp(arabili)' (B282), 'praestantis(simo)' (D294) - and the other adds little more - 'ob debita virtute et industria' (A278)⁸. The praise in two of these dedications is the earliest on record; Trajanic in one instance (A273), possibly Trajanic in the other (A278).

The usefulness of dedications by the *ordo* in illuminating the activity of patrons is, therefore, primarily restricted to (a) the provinces of Africa Proconsularis and Numidia, and (b) the late Antonine era onwards. Examination of the context of these dedications within these guidelines, on a group by group basis, reveals a marked difference of approach in appraising the services of local patrons, and those of non-local origin acting as administrators.

seems more naturally to describe the patron, than the *populus* in the line 'lepcimagnensis fidelis et innocens ordo cum populo pr(a)estantissimo patrono votis omnibus conlocavit' (contra C. Lepelley, 'Les cités', II p.359 n.109). Besides the examples of A182a, 'patron. pr(a)estantissimo', A195 'patrono prae[stan]tiss.', A198 'patron[o praestantis]simo' and D294 'patrono praestantis.', there is an exact analogy in the dedication to the colleague of our recipient, described as 'praestanti patro(no)' (A180). The *populus* appear only with the epithet *quietissimus* in Tripolitanan epigraphy, and then only on 3 occasions (IRT564, 574, 578, cf. IRT index). For the recipient Virius Nicomachus Flavianus, vicarius and his colleague Decimius Hilarianus Hesperius, proconsul Africae, see below. N.B. For 4 dedications of an indeterminate C3 -C4 date, only one fails to express gratitude to the patron (A257A) and may be pre-Diocletianic (the parameters are c268-320 cf. C. Lepelley, op. cit. p.411 and n.45). The others are B189, 190, 192.

⁸ The other two dedications are B276 (C2) and D279 (C1).

(1) Group (A) Patrons

Prior to the late C3, only 3 dedications by ordines to group (A) patrons in Africa Proconsularis make any appraisal of the recipient. None provide any indication as to what the specific beneficia of the patron concerned might have been. Two texts simply add a qualifying adjective - 'optimo' (A61), 'rarissimo' (A109) - while the third (and latest in date) also adjoins the banal locution 'ob merita' (A119). Prior to the Dominate, Numidia provides only two examples of dedications by ordines praising patrons. One, of an indeterminate C2 - C3 date, appears only to add the pithy description '[bene me]renti' (A253), but the other, of an early C3 date (AD226), is similar in tone, if not in length, to 19 wordy eulogies to group (A) administrators from the Dominate⁹. The phrase employed, 'ob insignem erga cives benivolentiam et iustitiam eius' (A242), praises a primary aspect of a governor's function, his dispensation of justice, and this theme, frequently in conjunction with the notion that the governor acted to soften the law in his interpretation of it, is a prominent feature of most C4 encomia. The early dating of the Numidian text is possibly to be connected to the fact that the dedicand, Sigus, was not a direct client of the legate being honoured, but a small castellum of veterans in the territory of the client (the Cirtan confederation). Visits by the legate are likely to have been infrequent, and probably only occasioned by the need to address particular problems as they arose. The gratitude expressed in our text, therefore, ^{was} almost certainly due to a specific action of the legate benefitting the community of Sigus, quite possibly in response to a direct request for aid.

While C4 eulogies to patrons never conform to any rigid pattern, inevitably the sheer mass of honorific dedications engendered the repetition of certain key concepts related to the quality of the patron's character and administration. Although the provenance of the texts exhibits a strong bias towards Tripolitana - and in particular Lepcis Magna and Sabratha - 3 of the 5 non-Tripolitanan C4 eulogies indicate a similar frequency of repetition of the same key concepts¹⁰, and this impression gains support from the

⁹ 19 eulogies - see list (A) Beneficia et Merita, A156, 158, 159, 163, 165, 175, 176, 176a, 180, 182, 182a, 183, 193, 194, 195, 196, 204, 259, 259a.

¹⁰ See list (A) Beneficia et Merita. There are 16 C4 Tripolitanan eulogies. Those outside are from Bulla Regia A163, 201, Madauros A175, and Milev, A259, 259a. Virtues shared with their Tripolitanan

language employed in eulogies of the C3 and C4 to patrons outside Tripolitana from group C, where numbers are more numerous. The qualities most often singled out for admiration, are, in order of frequency, iustitia, integritas, virtus, moderatio, aequitas, and beneficia¹¹.

The sincerity with which these attributes were applied may be doubted - in some instances at least - by their sheer banality. We may note, that with the exception of beneficia, and with the addition of certain other less commonly assigned virtues (innocentia, amor, benignitas, benevolentia etc.) all of these terms can be found applied to administrators who are not described as patrons¹². Clearly then, whilst equity, probity and the discretionary application of an administrator's powers of jurisdiction might occasion expressions of gratitude by the ordo, these qualities were not in themselves always sufficient to ensure his co-optation.

contemporaries include virtus (A259), iustitia (A163), integritas (A163, 259a), aequitas (A259a) and beneficia (A175).

¹¹ The most commonly praised virtues of African administrators, groups (A) and (C), patrons and 'non-patrons' are set out below.

Virtue	Patrons - Group (A)	Group (C)	'Non-Patrons' - Group (A)	Group (C)
virtus	A156, 158, 159, 194, 195, 196, 204, 259, 278, (cf. IA 22, 26)			NC7, 20A
iustitia	A156, 159, 163, 165, 176a, 180, 182, 182a, 196, 204, 226, 242 (cf. IA23, 24A, 53)	C116, 147 (cf. IC16, 24, 29)	NA14, 15	
integritas	A156, 159, 163, 165, 176a, 182a, 193, 194, 195, 259a (cf. IA22, 24A, 25)	C94, 123, 147, 160, 161 (cf. IC16)	NA14	
moderatio	A156, 159, 176a, 182a, 194, 195, 204 (cf. IA21, 23, 24A, 26)	C157	NA12, 14	
aequitas	A158, 159, 204, 259a	C157, 161 (cf. IC27)	NA15	
beneficia	A175, 176a, 182a, 183	C93, 168a		
innocentia	A156, 159, 194, 273 (cf. IA20, 53)	C123, 157	NA6, 6a, 19a, 21	NC7, 17, 20A
benignitas	A182a, 194		NA14	NC19
benevolentia	A242 (cf. IA24A)	C94, 116	NA14	
amor	A194, 259 (cf. IA24)	C174		NC16, 17
vigor	A156, 158, 176			

¹² See list (D) - cf. NC7 (virtus), NA14, 15 (iustitia), NA14 (integritas), NA12, 14 (moderatio), NA15 (aequitas), NA6, 6a, 19a, NC7, 17 (innocentia), NA19a (industria), NC16, 17 (amor), NA14, NC19 (benignitas), NA14 (benevolentia). On 'amor' see below p.286.

There is, in fact, considerable difficulty in determining on the basis of eulogies alone, the qualities which distinguished those administrators chosen as patron, from those who were not. The issue is further complicated, of course, by the possibility that some administrators simply elected not to accept co-optation. Only three dedications to patrons offer specific examples which qualify or supplement any or all of the virtues assigned them. Two define or indicate a patron's beneficia (A176a, 182a), the other his iustitia (A180). The texts all derive from Tripolitana (Lepcis Magna (A176a and 180) and Sabratha (A182a)).

The dedication praising the 'iustitia' of the proconsul of Africa, Decimius Hilarianus Hesperius states that the occasion of this 'iustitia' was his involvement in a case concerning the Tripolitanans entrusted to him by the emperor ('quam causae Tripolitanorum delegatae (sic) sacro iudici exhibuit'). Hesperius' jurisdiction in this affair, was given in exceptional circumstances, and this alone may suffice to explain why the dedication defines Hesperius' rôle. The affair - as we know from Ammianus (28.6) - was one of great notoriety. The complaints of the Tripolitanans were largely vindicated by the report brought down by Hesperius and his colleague (and fellow patron of Lepcis Magna), the vicarius Virius Nicomachus Flavianus (A181) both of whom, the principal villain of the drama, the count Romanus, accused of bias in favour of the province ('inclinatos in provinciae partem', Amm. 28.6.29). Ammianus' account of the affair, and his praise of the administrators charged with its investigation¹³, is the only independent evidence extant that allows for cross reference with any of the 28 epigraphic eulogies to group (A) patrons¹⁴. Ammianus incidentally enables us to be certain that no inference can be drawn on the extreme brevity of the ordo's encomium of Hesperius' colleague - the praise being diverted instead to the emperors - and C. Lepelley considers Flavianus to have been 'le principal artisan de la réparation obtenue par les Tripolitains' (Les cités', II p.359).

¹³ 28.6.28 'ad Hesperium proconsulem et Flavianum vicarium audiendi sunt missi, quorum aequitas auctoritate mixta iustissima'.

¹⁴ The sole instance of a patron recorded on one of these 28 texts reappearing on another inscription from the same client community, merely records the administrator's erection of a statue to the emperor 'numini maiestatique eius semper devotus' (IRT476 cf. A182).

The two eulogies that give specifics as to the beneficia of a patron (A176a, 182a) are also the longest on record to patrons. Both men were perfectissimi praesides of Tripolitania. One, T. Flavius Archontius Nilus, is described as 'instaurator moenium publicorum' (A176a), the other, Flavius Vivius Benedictus, as having restored the baths at no expense to the people of Sabratha ('citra ullius dispendium' (A182a))¹⁵. Once again, however, although the use of the term beneficia is not applied, examples of specific instances where an administrator is praised for benefitting a community are known for officials of equal rank and position, who are not styled patrons. The most striking parallel is the dedication (of comparable length to the two discussed) to another v.p., praeses of Tripolitana, Fl(avius) Nepotianus (NA14), whom the ordo at Lepcis Magna extols 'quod civitatum moenia operum instauratione vel novitate decoraverit'. The same text commends his strengthening of the limes and bestows all the most familiar terms of praise to his administration, 'iustitia', 'integritas', 'moderatio' and 'benignitas'. Another Tripolitanan administrator, the v.c., comes et dux, Fl(avius) Ortygius (NA18), likewise a 'non-patron', is singled out for praise for his part in repelling Austurian tribesmen ('Austurianorum rabia repraessa' (sic)). From Africa Proconsularis there is besides the lengthy encomium, already discussed (see pp.100-1) to [-]Iulius Festus Hymetius, the proconsul, said to have dispelled a grave famine, revitalised the office of the provincial priesthood and displayed 'iustitia' and 'aequitas' whilst in office (NA15). All three men possess all the hallmarks of eligibility to the patronate, and the apparent failure of co-optation to occur can only be said to be enigmatic. Their case was, however, far from being unique, five other dedications to group (A) 'non-patrons' (two C4) also being known to have endorsed the administration of the recipient with an encomium (NA2, 6, 6a, 11 and 12 - see list (D)).

¹⁵ The funds, as C. Lepelley notes, were evidently drawn from the imperial fisc, even though the emperors are not - unusually - thanked for this indulgence (op. cit., p.375 n.12).

(2) Group (C) Patrons

As many of the eulogies addressed to group (C) patrons more closely resemble in their language those to their group (A) counterparts, than comparable types for group (B) patrons, the order of discussion of group (B) and (C) patrons is here reversed. The table setting out the most commonly praised virtues of African administrators (n.11) illustrates close parallels in the attribution of ideal standards of behaviour to patrons of groups (A) and (C). With the exception of the abstract attribute 'virtus', almost all of the qualities we have seen praised before - *iustitia*, *integritas*, *moderatio*, *aequitas* etc. - reappear. These terms as applied to group (C) patrons are almost certainly directed at the patron in his rôle as administrator,¹⁶ and ought not to be seen as patronal attributes in any specific sense, or as allusions to beneficia performed outside of their administrative capacity, or even anterior to their African posting. In two examples, where the dedicating ordo provides instances of patron's beneficia, these relate specifically to the recipient's actions as administrator, although neither text - uniquely - actually mentions the recipient's patronate. The beneficia concern in one case, the restoration of the Ulpian basilica and forum at Lepcis Magna 'publico sumptu' (C157, cf. IRT543), and in the other, the action of a cavalry commander at Auzia, in overcoming an enemy chieftain, Faraxen (C286, cf. C9047).

The point of divergence in eulogies to group (C) patrons lies in the occasional additional mention of the patron's private generosity¹⁷. Thus, besides the alleged 'integritas' and 'innocentia' of Caelius Severus (signo) Thoracius, consularis, curator and patron of Puppit (C123), the dedication to him reveals that Thoracius restored the forum and surrounding buildings 'sua liberalitate'; Similarly, another senatorial curator and patron of 'integritas', Valerius Romanus, is praised for restoring a statue of Venus, plundered by thieves who had gained entry into the temple by removing part

¹⁶ cf. B.H. Warmington, p.46 - 'iustitia and integritas were qualities to be thankfully recognised in the former (curatores) and taken for granted in the latter (patroni)'.

¹⁷ See list B, A(1), B(1), L(1)cf. A(2), J(1), P(1), T(2). Where no such mention occurs (C93, 112, 147, 157, 161, 168, 168a., 243b), the dedications are distinguishable from those to group (A) patrons, only by such indications as 'alumnus' (C93) or 'patronus a parentibus' to describe the patron concerned (C168), tenure of a local cursus by the patron (C147), or description of the citizens as 'cives suos' (C112).

of the wall (C160, Sicca Veneria)¹⁸. A third curator, though of humbler (decurial) status, repaid the compliment to his 'iustitia' and 'benevolentia' by providing a theatrical show, a banquet and an oil distribution to the people at the dedication of his statue (C114, Furnus Minus). Another two curators are known to have provided building works ranging in importance from a major civic reconstruction (C266-7) to the provision of basins for the baths (C297). The evidence in these instances, however, derives not from honorific statue bases, but from a tabula patronatus and a private record of beneficence respectively. Although the evidence for generosity by group (C) patrons is primarily concerned with curators, other group (C) benefactors include a v.p., praeses of Tripolitana (C174) and, perhaps, a consularis of Numidia (A259) and a former legate of the proconsul of Africa (C78). The praeses of Tripolitana, Fl[avius] Victor Calpurnius, is particularly commended for his provision of games featuring a fine selection of beasts (Leptis Magna, AD340-50)¹⁹. The possible inclusion of the consularis of Numidia, Ceionius Italicus with group (C) patrons - already premised (p.238) - rests partly on the known African residence of other Ceionii, and partly on the attestation of some generous action ('liberalitas') of his, an attestation singular amongst all known dedications to non-local administrators by the ordo. Finally, the magnificent baths at Bulla Regia given by [Iul]ia Memmia [Pris]ca? Ru[-] Aemil[iana] Fidiana (C79), ^{were} probably due, at least in part, to the financial contribution of her father, a former legate of the African proconsul.

Two thirds (6/9) of the dedications to group (C) 'non-patrons' express the gratitude of the dedicating ordo (or curiae) to the recipient. As with similar dedications to group (C) patrons, curators again feature prominently. Of the four so recorded (NC7, 10, 16, 17), two are praised in generalisms 'amor' (NC16) and 'adfectio et simplicitas' (NC10). That these terms almost certainly cloak some tangible beneficence towards the community, may be judged by the near exclusive attribution of 'amor' and 'ad-

¹⁸ The dedication is, however, by the Venerii, not the ordo.

¹⁹ Calpurnius is also described as 'instaurator moenium publ[i]corum', a term carrying no suggestion of private contribution, but illustrating again the combination of private and public beneficia already seen evidenced on dedications to group (C) patrons. (See C. Lepelley, 'Les cités', II p.338 n.18. An identical expression to an administrator appears in IRT562 and 563 (=A176a), a similar one in IRT585 (=NA14)).

fectio' to local citizens²⁰. Only two group (A) patrons bear the attribute 'amor' on the dedications known for them, Magnius Asper Flavianus (A194) and Ceionius Italicus (A259), and local origin, residency, or some other personal connection with the client community has already been suggested for the latter (the origins of Magnius are unknown).²¹ In fact, the terms 'amor' and 'adfectio' in Africa are found applied to only two other administrators for whom local origin is not known, [Fl]avius Atilius Theodotus, legate of Numidia in 361-2 (IA24), and an anonymous senatorial curator rei publicae (IA20). Unlike the dedication to Magnius, that to Theodotus seems to relate the 'amor' to a specific occasion, viz. the construction of the forum ('[ob i]nstitutionem fori novi')²². Textual lacunae sever the exact connection, and it is possible (contra C. Lepelley - cf. n.21) that some private generosity related to the project was involved, with an enhanced likelihood that Theodotus, whose origins are unknown, was a local man or at least had some personal attachments to the community

²⁰ The frequency of attribution of 'amor' and affectio' amongst patrons (certi and incerti) and 'non-patrons' is set out below. Both words of course, are frequently applied by members of a family to each of her (e.g. IRT579) or by private clients and amici. Thus M. Sulpicius Felix (domus Roma), cavalry commander at Sala, is honoured by 38 amici 'ob affect(ionem)' (IA48).

HONORAND	AMOR				AD FECTIO		
	A	B	C	D	A	B	C
PATRONS	A194, 259 (=2)	B101, 115, 117, 118, 192, 199 (=6)	C160, 174, (=2)	D191 (=1)		B128, 240 (=2)	
NON-PATRONS		NB32, 64, 65, 67, 70, 86, 122, 123, 140, 143, 159 (=11)	NC8, 16, 17, (=2)			NB75, 119, 122, 138, 152 (=2)	NC10 (=1)
INCERTI	IA24(=1)	IB85 (=1)	IC29 (=1)		IA20 (=1)	IB30, 34, 80, 95, (=4)	

NB. The expression 'adfectio et simplicitas' is unusual in African epigraphy. Four near parallels also concern local citizens, C26271 (=NB86), C23226 (=NB138), C24101 and ILAI.g13071.

²¹ No other Magnii are recorded in the IRT indices.

²² C. Lepelley, op. cit., p.213 n.10, notes that dedications to governors initiating building projects are unusual - although cf. the few examples seen earlier from Lepcis Magna, to praesides termed 'instaurator moeniorum'. His suggestion that the legate must, therefore, have played some exceptional part in the work appears sound, but dismissal of the possibility of a private input by Theodotus, on the grounds that this would have been mentioned in the text, does not take into account the fact that the text is accephalous, and that the lacuna evidently refers to the 'amor' of Theodotus.

(Thubursicu Numidarum). African origo may also be deemed likely for the anonymous curator. F. Jacques ('Les curateurs', p.110) indicates that the majority of senatorial curators whose origo is known, were local men.

The other two curators classed as group (C) 'non-patrons', those whose beneficia are made explicit, provided significant benefactions and would appear, on the basis of their status, eminently suitable candidates for co-optation, being a clarissimus vir in one instance (NC7), and a vir perfectissimus, provincial priest and principalis in the other (NC17). While neither of the dedicating communities (Sufetula and Lepcis Magna respectively) can be said to show other curators as patrons, both are known to have co-opted local (or probably local) personages, equivalent in status (if not rank) and approximately contemporary to the two curators not so favoured. Little can be said of Sufetula's only verifiable patron, M. Ael[ius-] Candidia[nus] c.v., pro[-con]sularis (D191) of a late C3 - C4 dating, except to suggest that local origin, rather than an administrative post, seems indicated by what one can make of his fragmentary cursus,²³ and that his cursus was clearly more elevated than that attained by the clarissimus curator L. Caecilius Plautius Catullinus. Despite the gratitude of Sufetula for the latter's efforts in forcing down the price of grain ('circa frumentariae rei largam moderationem'), possibly at some personal cost, the decision not to co-opt Catullinus may finally have been determined on the lower ranking of his family within the local senatorial hierarchy. The fact that the dedication was made by the local curiae and not the ordo might, perhaps, still allow for the possibility that Catullinus was in fact patron, but mention of municipal patronage does appear in an identical context in a contemporary text from Bulla Regia (C155)²⁴.

²³ Cf. C. Lepelley, *op. cit.*, p.311 n.15 followed by Krause, p.4 n.9 who properly consider the proposed reading in PLRE 'pro[vinciae Byzacenae con]sularis' as strained. Nomenclature also offers some faint support for African origo. The only two senatorial or equestrian bearers of the cognomen Candidianus in the principate (both of the C3) have an African connection, Q. Paccius Victor Candidianus, citizen and patron of Furnos Minus (C112) and Macrobius Candidianus, procurator of Africa in 258 (PIR, M35). The name is, however, seldom attested epigraphically or otherwise in connection with Africa. A more telling indication of local origo is the expression '[ob insignem] almorem' applied to him - see above pp.209-10 and p.286 and n.20.

²⁴ On this point, note the inclusion of Q. Servaeus Fuscus Cornelianus c.v. (IB78B) and the anonymous official (curator?) (IC26A) as *patroni incerti*. Both were recipients of dedications by the curiae and the ordo, and both were benefactors. Inclusion of the former is based on the fact that the dedication by the ordo is known, and that a lacuna in the text requires a brief *laudatio*, a promising context for mention of the

Parallels between the perfectissimi, the patron, Fl[avius] Victor Calpurnius (C174) and the 'non-patron', T. Flavius Vibianus (signo) Heraclius (NC17) of Lepcis Magna are both closer and more certain than those indicated for the two Sufetulan clarissimi. To begin with both perfectissimi are almost certainly fellow-citizens and contemporaries or near-contemporaries, and the dedication omitting reference to Vibianus' patronate is erected by the ordo (rather than the curiae) and devoid of lacunae. Moreover, both men are mentioned as providers of munera. To the venatio of Calpurnius, seen earlier, may be compared an array of beasts at least as impressive, put on by Vibianus ('ob diversarum voluptatum exhibitionem et libycarum ferarum X'). The failure of Vibianus (and other members of his family - cf. NB67 and 98) to emerge as patron, despite high status and a propensity towards ostentatious liberality, must evidently be put down once again to the fact that while comparable in status to a contemporary patron, Vibianus was unable to match the patron in rank (Calpurnius was praeses of Tripolitana)²⁵. The size of both Lepcis Magna and Sufetula would permit a certain degree of latitude in selecting and rejecting members of their municipal élite as patron, and to accordingly enhance the title of patronus with greater prestige. An unambiguous example of this sort of winnowing at the highest levels of society can of course, be seen in the evident failure of five clarissimi and two perfectissimi to qualify as patrons on the album of Timgad.

Mention may finally be made of two group (C) 'non-patrons' other than curators, whose dedications testify to particular benefactions on their part. Both individuals enjoyed high equestrian ranking, A. Vitellius Felix Honoratus of Thugga (NC8) being f(isci) a(dvocatus) at patrimonium Karthag(inis), and L. Alfenus Senecio being a praeses of Mauretania Caesariensis (NC19), a province whose frontiers lay only some 10 km. from his patria Cuicul. Honoratus is said to have undertaken a legation on his patria's behalf at his own cost and of his own free will ('pro libertate publica

patronate. Inclusion of the latter rests on the incomplete state of the dedication by the curiae (possibly allowing for mention of the patronate) and the mention in the text of another dedication almost certainly by the ordo.

²⁵ The offices and status held by other members of Vibianus' family also indicate that his tenure of the perfectissimate was recent. This is less likely to be the case for Calpurnius.

volumtaria (sic) et gratuita legatione functo')²⁶, Senecio to have assisted Cuicul with prompt and practical aid whilst administering Mauretania ('quod promptissima benignitate sua utilitates coloniae suae splendidissime iuvit nuper cum provinciae Mauretaniae Caesariensi praeset'). Both actions would seem perfect illustrations of the services a patron might be called upon to provide, and as 'equites fonctionnels', both theoretically stood at least an even chance of anticipating co-optation²⁷.

The failure of Senecio to gain selection - as has already been argued (pp. 150-9) - appears to have been occasioned by the dominant rôle of the acting legates in all aspects of provincial life in Numidia, with the consequence that local citizens called upon by the major communities to act as patrons were chiefly - perhaps only - sought from pre-eminent senatorial families, additional representation - until the the critical events of the mid C3 - apparently being regarded as superfluous. It should be noted, however, that besides the legate Ti.Cl(audius) Subatianus Proculus (IC36), no patron or potential patron of local origo is known at all for Cuicul until the mid C3.

That Honoratus does not appear as patron, despite the fact that by virtue of his office in Carthage he was well placed to represent his community and that he was clearly eager to do so, is presumably testimony to a large pool of illustrious citizens and residents of Thugga at this date (c253-60), equally (or better) able and predisposed to provide services of a similar sort. In fact, a small but informative body of texts, supports the view that from the C2 on, Thugga enjoyed enviable access to powerful intervention from such quarters. Prior to the text concerning Honoratus, we know

²⁶ For other voluntary ambassadors, documented in Africa, cf. Abbir Maius (AE(1975)872=IB71), Auzia (C20758), Bulla Regia (AE(1964)177, Calama (ILAlgI275), municipium Chullitanum (C6.1684 cf. A164), Gigthis (C11032, 22737 = NB118, ILA21 = NB165), Thamugadi (C6.1803), Thuburnica (ILA478), Thubursicu Numidarum (ILAlgI1300), Thugga (C26637, 26637a, AE(1963)94 = IB4), Volubilis (IAM448=NB183), Tripolitana (C11025=NB97 (and IRT588 = NB97b cf. IRT511 = NB97a). For legations not specified as being gratuita, cf. the dedications of statues and tabulae patronatus to patrons abroad (A8, 9-9c, 50,67, 164a-e, 301, B76, D2). See also Fronto, Ad Amicos II, 11, Suetonius, Tib. 31, 2, Dig. XXII 6.9.5, C5.6990 (=IA5), C6.1476 (=IA19), IAM 307 (=IA48), Eph. Ep. 8p. 136 n.532 (=IA15-16), C10.1684 (=NA1), ILAlg I3062-3 (=NA6a,6), C10.3846 (=NA13), C6.1736 (=NA15), D9399, IAM100, ILT625, C14464, 14428, 14451, 15868, 23956, 17899. For delegations in the late empire cf. C. Lepelley, 'Les cités', Ip.211 and 253-4n.26, J.U. Krause p.54 n.263, and C. Th. 6.22.2, 11.1.34, 12.1.9, 27, 29, 41, 59, 60, 64, 73, 166, 186, 12.12.1, 6 and Nov. Val. 13.1, Julian, letter 54, Ammianus 28, 6. None of the envoys are recorded as patron. For envoys of equestrian or higher status besides Honoratus, cf. IAM448, C6.1686, CTh. 12.1.186, Nov. Val. 13.1. On legations in general, see especially F. Millar, 'The Emperor in the Roman World (31BC-AD337)', London, 1977, pp.363-456.

²⁷ See pp.251-2 for the conclusion that local 'equites fonctionnels' were (from the evidence of dedications erected to them by the ordo) co-opted as often as not. The percentage is 50% exactly.

that Thugga had been able to call upon the assistance of a number of senators to act on her behalf. These persons include the anonymous [def]ensor immunitatis perticae Carthaginiensium (AE(1963)94 = IB4) and members of the Pullaienii (B55), Aelii (IB73, 74) and an unidentified gens (IB115), all of whom probably represented the town as patron²⁸. Moreover, another senator, Mummius Faustinus (IB88), a contemporary of Honoratus, was apparently engaged on the same mission as him (viz. the acquisition of colonial status for Thugga) in a more senior capacity. This, at least, is the opinion of C. Poinssot, on the basis of an unpublished text²⁹. If this is so, then a very close analogy can be drawn between the position of Honoratus and that of another voluntary ambassador on Thugga's behalf, but a century and a half earlier, Q. Marius Faustinus (AE(1963)99). The efforts of both men, neither of whom appear to have been co-opted, were overshadowed by the participation of influential senators, whose patronage may well have been mentioned in one of the relevant texts, that to Mummius Faustinus being unpublished, the other to the anonymous [de]fensor immunitatis (see above), being fragmentary.

²⁸ Another senatorial family, the Pompeii Appii, are attested at Thugga at the beginning of the C4 (cf. IB123), and almost certainly Thuggan, or connected to Thugga, are the C3 consuls, L. Marius Perpetuus and his homonymous son (PIRM311, 312, cf. pp.139-40).

²⁹ 'M. Licinius Rufus, patronus pagi et civitatis Thuggensis', BACTH, n.s V (1969) p.238 n.85.

(3) Group (B) Patrons

The total of extant dedications erected by the ordo to group (B) patrons is over treble that known for group (C) (77 cf. 24). The comparative ratios of texts expressing or not expressing gratitude, however, differs only marginally. Thus 48 of the 77 dedications to group (B) patrons, or 62.34%, withhold all mention of gratitude, cf. 13 of the 24 dedications to patrons of group (C), or 54.17%. For group (A) patrons, by contrast, the comparative ratio actually indicates a bias in favour of texts expressing gratitude (31/51 or 60.78%)³⁰. This bias, as has been seen, is due almost entirely to those dedications of a C4 or C5 date, and group (A) patrons show a greater concentration of persons assignable to this period than any other group³¹. Moreover, when all texts expressing gratitude to patrons are compared, a marked polarity manifests itself between those to group (A) patrons, on the one hand, where the laudations are almost entirely reduced to abstractions, and those to patrons of groups (B) and (C), where there is substance as well as sound, in the majority of instances. Thus, only three dedications to group (A) patrons offer any specific details of beneficia (see above), and only one other (A259) - of doubtful attribution to group (A), as has been seen - indicates that any personal generosity was involved. These four texts represent a proportion of only 13.79% of the 29 group (A) patrons for whom some expression of gratitude is known. For patrons of group (C) this proportion reaches 54.54% (6/11); for those of group (B), 51.61% (16/31), and the details provided in the dedications to patrons of both groups, always indicate that the beneficia were bestowed in a private capacity³². The nature of the beneficia, revealed by the 16 honorific texts to group (B) patrons is considered a little later in the chapter (pp.304-23), in conjunction with all beneficia known for patrons of group (B) and (C). Comparison is there made with benefactions provided by donors whose patronal status is unknown or not given, and some assessment of the relative proclivity of various status groups towards liberality is attempted.

³⁰ cf. list (C) 3 and 5 chapter 1 for these totals and the references. Details of beneficia et merita for groups (B) and (C) appear in list (B) this chapter, for group (A) in list (A) this chapter.

It has already been observed that group (B) patrons are praised with some frequency for their 'amor', an attribute bestowed on occasion to group (C) patrons but seldom to those of group (A). Two other rather colourless attributes may be mentioned here, 'merita' and 'innocentia'. The phrase 'ob merita', was easily the most common laudatory formula throughout Africa, although far less favoured for administrators,³³ whether local (group C) or of external origo (group (A)). As with 'innocentia', 'merita' was applied freely to patrons and 'non-patrons' alike, although it was more common for the latter. 'Non-patrons' also appear more frequently with the 'ob merita' phrase unadorned (13 texts cf. 2 to patrons). The term 'innocentia' does not appear in the laudations of any group (B) patron. Little importance, however, need be attached to this fact, as the epithet was somewhat banal, and is found attributed to five group (B) 'non-patrons' (3 equestrians NB57, 85 and 98 and 2 II viri, NB119 and 138), as well as to patrons and 'non-patrons' of group (A) and (C)³⁴.

The absence on dedications erected by the ordo to patrons, as well as 'non-patrons' of group (B) of the terms *virtus*, *iustitia*, *integritas*, *moderatio* and *aequitas*, indicates that these were seen as attributes applicable solely to administration, at least in its ideal form. The precision of the language of African epigraphy in this regard, admitting but

³¹ 26/108 group (A) patrons or 24.07% date to the Dominate, cf. 12/138 or 8.7% for group (B), 8/34 or 25.53% for group (C) and 1/16 or 6.25% for group (D). References are A156, 158, 159, 163, 164-164e, 165, 166 (=A175), 171, 172, 173, 176-176a, 177, 180, 181, 182, 182a, 183, 193, 194, 195, 196, 198, 201, 204, 259-259a, 300, 301, B162, 167, 169, 170, 179-179a, 184-5, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 299, C157, 160, 161, 168-168a, 174, 178, 258, 266-7, D197. For group (A), this proportion exceeds 2/3 (18/26).

N.B. Note that although the % for group (C) resembles that for group (A), only half of the group (C) patrons known from the Dominate (4/8) appear on dedications in their honour by the ordo.

³² Specifics of beneficia provided on dedications expressing gratitude are known for the following:

Group (C) - C79, 93, 116, 123, 168a and 174 (and cf. C160, a dedication by the Venerii, rather than the ordo, but similar in language and content).

Group (B) - B57 (2), 58, 69, 72, 91, (1), 101, 137, 154, 184-5, 190, 192, 200, 202, 205, 235, 241. Unspecified beneficia et merita are attributed to the following.

Group (C) - C112, 147, 157, 161, 168.

Group (B) - B57(1), 73, 74, 86, 91(2), 105, 113, 115, 117, 128, 141, 189, 199, 240, 282 (and cf. B268 and 269 praised by an unknown dedicand (probably the ordo) 'ob merita'). Note also that 3 group (B) patrons are praised on dedications by the ordo to family members, viz. B75 (*defensor causae publicae*), B118 (*ob amorem*) and B129 (*ad remuneranda merita*).

³³ 'ob merita' - patrons (A) 119, 259 (cf. 176a) = 2; (B) B57, 73, 101, 113, 141*, 154, 202, 205, 235, 268*, 269* (cf. 45, 129, 184-5) = 11 (B268 and 269 appear on the same text. The dedicand (unknown) is probably the ordo.) (C) (cf. C174). - 'non-patrons' (A) NA11, 14, 15 (cf. 18) (B) NB50, 51, 53, 72, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 91*, 93*, 94, 101*, 107*, 108(2)*, 118(2)*, 124, 141, 154*, 161, 166, 169*, 173*, 180, 183, 184*, 185*, 186*, 187, 188, 189, 192, 196*, (cf. 42, 68, 89, 97, 97a, 118(1), 119, 131, 168) = 33. (c) NC8 (cf. 7) = 1.

N.B. Numbers asterisked add nothing to the laudation.

³⁴ For groups (A) and (C) cf. n.11.

one deviation, is indeed striking³⁵. Particularly interesting also, is the similar precision applied to the words *beneficia*, *liberalitas* and *munificentia*. Aside from one uncertain example from the mid C1 BC (B1, 45 BC) and two very late attestations at the end of the C4 (B184-5, 379-83 and B205, post 389) the term *beneficia* is exclusively reserved for imperial administrators (whether of local or external origo), whilst with one dubious mid C4 exception (Ceionius Italicus, A259 - see above), *liberalitas* and *munificentia* are attributed solely to local citizens (whether administrators or not)³⁶. In other words, *beneficia* were conceived as being the peculiar property of the good administrator, *liberalitas* and *munificentia* of the patriotic citizen. A much less common term, on the other hand, '*benevolentia*', is occasionally found applied to administrators and non-administrators, patrons and non-patrons alike³⁷.

(4) Group (D) Patrons

There are only two brief allusions to the merits and services of group (D) patrons. Both patrons are attested by honorific bases and both are described by abstract locutions of a familiar variety. The senator M. Ael[ius-] Candidia[nus], patron of Sufetula (D191) has already been discussed in connection with possible local origin (p.287 and n.23 above). The phrase ['ob singularem a]morem' applied to him renders this assumption all but certain. The anonymous patron of Lemellef (D294) on the

³⁵ I am concerned only with dedications by ordines and curiae. The exception appears in the transcription of a decision taken by the council of Lepcis Magna to award a *biga* to Ti. Plautius Lupus, a particularly munificent municipal dignitary (IB57). The ordo refers to Lupus' '*singularis integritas et modestia*'. A possible exception, which appears on a dedication to Asicia Victoria (NB121), may be considered doubtful ('*quae probo animo et exem[plari] virtute*'). Note also a dedication to L. Iulius Victor Modianus, a citizen of vicus Maracitanus, who is honoured by persons unknown '*ob eximiam erga se benevolentiam [et] integritate[m-]*'. Although included in the incerti (IB66), I now feel that the word *integritas* is here being applied by clients, and the text is, therefore, also entered under 'Personal Patrocinia' (P62). Dedications by private citizens indicate less rigidity. Thus a nephew describes his uncle, the patron Q. Iulius Maximus Demetrianus, as '*singularis integritatis vir*' (B144-5), and private clients from Africa honour a senator in Rome '*ob innumerabilia in se beneficia*' (C6.1366). On the other hand, the dedication by a private client to the praeses of Baetica, Aulus Caecina Tacitus, erected at Sala (IAM 306) seems to indicate that Tacitus' jurisdiction extended over Tingitana. Tacitus is described as '*[vir? in]nocentiae et iustitiae singularis*'. For the differing connotations possible for the word '*beneficium*' in literature, cf. R.P. Saller, *op. cit.*, pp. 17-21.

³⁶ In Krause's list of qualities attributed to C4 patrons serving as administrators (p.25 n.113) no distinction is drawn between *liberalitas* and *munificentia*, and the other epithets (*iustitia*, *moderatio* etc.). Besides the single instance of *liberalitas* already cited for Ceionius Italicus (A25a), a probable native of Cirta, note that the sole attestation of *munificentia* is applied to Anicius Paulinus, whose local origins are certain - he was *patronus originalis*.

³⁷ *benevolentia* - A242, NA14, C94, C116, B86, NB126. See also IA24A, IB66, C2273).

other hand, has already been considered a possible administrator (see pp.208-9) by virtue of the term 'patrono praestantis(simo)'. While this term is found only for administrators in Africa, there is no compelling reason to connect the two, and we may note the similar phrase 'patrono incomparabili' applied to local non-administrators (B105,282).

(B) The Evidence of Dedications Erected to Family Members of Patrons by the Ordo

Of the 18 patrons attested as such on 23 dedications to their family, all but three appear with no indication of their services to the community. The 3 patrons concerned are all group (B) patrons with clients in Africa Proconsularis (B75, 118, 129). The recipient of one dedication is not described as patron in one instance (cf. IB83), and the dedications are acephalous in the remaining two (B75, 129). The banal attributes of *merita* (B129) and *amor* (B118) are given to both the recipient and the patron on two texts, whilst the third describes the patron as *defensor causae publicae* (B75, cf. IB89 for an anonymous advocate (and patron) from Vallis similarly described).

(C) The Evidence of Benefactions Recorded by the Patrons Themselves and Sundry other Types of Evidence for Patronal Benefactions

Specific patronal benefactions or indications of munificence are primarily known by either dedications of building works or smaller monuments (statues and altars) erected by the patrons themselves (21 patrons, 23 texts) or by honorific dedications to the patrons. The latter are principally statue bases erected by the ordo (22 patrons, 22 texts - see p.291 and n.32), but also include two *tabulae patronatus*, (B1, C266-7) and a statue base erected by the *Venerii* (*cultores* of Venus - C160). Finally there is the literary reference by St. Augustine both to the *venatio* of bears and spectacles '*nunquam ibi antea visa*' put on by [Cor]nelius Romanianus in Thagaste, as well as his exceptionally generous provision of daily banquets, apparently to all of the populace (B179-9a).

(D) The Contribution of Patrons as Benefactors - Building Benefactions and Games (a) Statistics

R. Duthoy in an important article, 'Sens et fonction du patronat municipal durant le principat', *Ant. Class.*, 53 (1984) pp.145-56, makes a primary distinction between patrons and benefactors. If patrons are found as benefactors, this is not because benefaction was 'une composante essentielle du patronage', but because the municipal élite had an obligation to provide benefactions, whether they were patrons or not (p.151). If this view is sound, the overall differences between the benefactions of patrons and those of 'non-patrons' from the same social group and community ought to be marginal. The intention here is to compare those two areas of munificence normally entailing the highest outlay - buildings and games. After establishing the percentage of patrons for each major social group providing these benefactions, firstly from benefactors of buildings and games as a whole, and secondly from all local (group B) and (C) patrons, comparison of the benefactions themselves will be made for patrons and 'non-patrons' sharing the same social status and patria.

Details of the nature of the buildings and games provided by patrons appears in list (B) A-L. Similar detail for the same benefactions provided by 'non-patrons' is impossible within the framework of this thesis, but references to texts and provenance categorised chronologically and according to the status of the donor are given in lists (E) - (F). On the same lists also appear comparative references to patronal benefactors. A summary of the totals for patrons and 'non-patrons' from lists (E) and (F) is given in list (G).

It is abundantly apparent from the figures provided in list (G) that patrons formed but a small minority of African citizens with a proclivity and/or an obligation to be generous. In fact, the proportion of patrons to 'non-patrons' amongst donors of buildings and games is almost identically insignificant - 24/765 or 3.14% for the former, and 3/95 or 3.16% for the latter. From the same list, two other features are equally apparent.

(a) The bulk of evidence derives from Africa Proconsularis (551/765 or 72.03% for building benefactions; 82/95, or a high 86.32% for games).

(b) The milieu from which the majority of benefactors come (at least those not attested as patrons) is that of the lower-middle range of municipal bourgeoisie (or persons of unknown, but in most cases probably similar, status) i.e. the group classified as 'Others' (637/742 or 85.85% for building benefactors; and 75/92, or 81.52% for donors of games). The proportion of patrons to 'non-patrons' for benefactors from this status group - precisely that in which patrons of groups (B) and (C) are least represented - drops well below that given above for all status groups - a mere 0.78% for building benefactors (5/642) cf. 3.13%, and only marginally more for donors of games - 1.32% (1/76) cf. 3.16%.

That the majority of our benefactors derive from Africa Proconsularis - the province best attested in African epigraphy in general, occasions no surprise. The fact that they also, for the most part, fall in the lowest of our status groups, is similarly in accord with the far greater proportion of society which they represent, and the obligations of municipal magistrates to at least meet the *summa legitima* imposed on the offices they held, and, where possible - given the fierce emulation within the decurial class - to exceed it by *adiectio* or *pollicitatio*³⁸. The failure of so many persons from the decurial class documented as building benefactors to emerge as patrons, is further testimony to the limited eligibility persons of this background enjoyed as potential patrons. This is so even for those individuals whose benefactions suggest that they were among the wealthiest and best connected of their class.

The proportion of patrons as building benefactors in Africa amongst other status groups reveals a dramatic improvement upon that seen for those classified as 'Others' (0.78%), and climbs progressively as the status of the groups improves. Percentages derived from the fractions of patrons to 'non-patrons' for each status group (the totals

³⁸ See P. Veyne, 'Deux inscriptions de Vina', *Karthago*, IX (1958) pp. 93-6; M. Leglay, 'Taxatio et autonomie municipale d'après une nouvelle inscription de Cuicul en Algérie', *Akte des IV int. Kongresses für griechische und lateinische Epigraphik* 1962 (1964) p.228.; R. Duncan-Jones, 'Costs, Outlays and *Summae Honorariae* from Roman Africa', *PBSR*, XXX (1962) pp.65-6; 'The Economy of the Roman Empire: Quantitative Studies', Cambridge, 1982, pp.86-7; P.D.A. Garnsey, 'Taxatio and *Pollicitatio* in Roman Africa', *J.R.S.*, LXI (1971) pp.116-8 for these distinctions, and cf. F. Jacques, 'Voluntariat et compétition dans les carrières municipales durant le Haut-Empire', *Ktéma*, VI (1981), p.262, and 'Ampliatio et Mora: évergètes récalcitrants d'Afrique romaine', *Ant. Af.*, IX (1975) pp.159-60; and A. Beschtaouch, 'Taxatio et élections municipales en Afrique romaine', *Rev. Hist. de Droit*, XLV (1967) pp.483-8.

appear in list (G)) are set out below. Comparable percentages for donors of munera have not been given, the total of patrons (3) being too small for subdivision to be of any value.

Table (A) % of Patrons Compared to 'Non Patrons' as Building Benefactors in Africa According to Status

Senators	Eq. F.	Eq. H.	Sub Eq.	Others	Total
26.09% (=6/23)	21.43% (= 3/14)	15.79% (= 6/38)	8.51% (= 4/47)	0.78% (= 5/642)	3.14% (= 24/765)

One might anticipate from these figures, that the contribution of patrons as building benefactors exactly reversed the trend exhibited for 'non-patrons'. One might further conclude that the marked preference for co-opting persons of high status was often predicated upon a generous return in the form of public construction. In fact, the opposite appears to have been true, the relatively high percentage of local senatorial patrons revealed as building benefactors, for example, being simply a reflection of their numerical dominance of the patronal rolls. That this is so may be gauged (a) by observing the proportion of all patron building benefactors that each status group represents, and (b) by comparing the proportion of these building benefactors within each patronal status group. Since comparison is being made, not with 'non-patrons', but with other patrons, some minor adjustment of the figures is required. The four patrons excluded as joint benefactors, or as benefactors in their own right but closely connected to other patronal donors (B7, 38, 40, 59) may be restored (see n.39) and the patron of the curia, M. Manlius Modestus Quietianus, equo publico (CB1) can be disregarded. The total of 'equites honorifiques' is, therefore, 5 and not 6 (less CB1); the total of 'sub equestrians' 6 and not 4 (adding B38, 40); the total of 'Others', 7 and not 5 (adding B7, 59); and the grand total 27 and not 24. The adjusted figures for each patronal status group of building benefactors form the following proportion of all patronal building benefactors:

Table (B)

Senators	Eq. F.	Eq. H.	Sub Eq.	Others
6/27 = 22.22%	3/27 = 11.11%	5/28 = 17.86%	6/26 = 23.08%	7/27 = 25.93%

These percentages indicate a slight shift from those seen above (table (A)) for senators and equestrians, but a large proportional increase for sub-equestrians (8.51% to 23.08%) and a massive improvement for 'Others' (0.78% to 25.93%). On these statistics, senators, equestrians, 'sub-equestrians' and 'Others' make a roughly equal contribution as building donors. While the proportions from table (B), go a considerable way towards placing the rôle played by the 'Others' category in a more realistic perspective, the proportions still exhibit distortion, due to the unequal distribution of all local patrons within each group. This bias favours in particular the senators, who form almost half the total (74/158 or 49.69%). A more accurate picture of the real contribution made by each group from the extant evidence may be gained by comparing the proportion of building benefactors to 'non-building benefactors' within each group. The percentages so derived are as follows:

Table (C)

Senators	Eq. F.	Eq. H.	Sub Eq.	Others	% Total
6/79 = 7.6%	3/19 = 15.79%	5/14 = 35.71%	6/26 = 23.08%	7/32 = 21.88%	104.06%

The reversal of fortune for senatorial building donors is the most immediately observable difference here. In fact the senatorial contribution is certainly under represented. When one considers the high ratio of senators co-opted in relation to other status groups (cf. table (C), p251), there is a high probability that most of the senatorial 'non-patrons' attested as building benefactors were also patrons. This probability is accentuated by three factors (a) None of the donors involved are attested on honorific dedications by the ordo, the most frequent textual type recording senatorial patrons (59.79% cf. p.32) (b) 8 of the 14 texts are lacunary, and may have recorded the senator's patronate (see p.172n.31, n.3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 15, 20 for references and detail) and another is unpublished (see p.172 n.31, n.19) (c) Mention

of the patronate on private commemorations of benefactions by senators is likely to be an uncommon occurrence in any event (only one example, B90, is attested). This is so because, being outside the *cursus* proper, mention of the patronate was optional, and is in fact rarely instanced on the initiative of either senators or 'equites fonctionnels'. Failure to mention patronage by either group need carry, then, virtually no inference of non-co-optation.

For the reasons cited above, and because a high proportion of the texts concerning them are also fragmentary (8/12 - C1578, 4516, 14727, 26178, ILA1gI1292, 2035, AE(1936) 136, (1985) 871 - cf. list (B)), the total of 'equites fonctionnels' similarly requires addition from those classed as 'non patrons'.

One approach to redressing the balance and arriving at something like the actual representation of each patronal status group as building donor, is to add to the total of senators and 'equites fonctionnels' attested as building benefactors, a proportion of 'non patron' building donors of the same status totalled in list (G), whose patronate may be considered highly potential. If the proportion added is derived from that estimated on a comparison of patrons and 'non-patrons' attested on honorific bases (see table (C) p.251 for these ratios), these additions ought not to be too wide of the mark. For patronal building benefactors of the three lower status groups, who were far less prone to drop the title of patron from their status indication, the proportion (again derived from table (C) p.251) of potential additions ought not to be applied to all 'non patron' building benefactors of the same status, but only to those known by lacunary texts which may be put roughly at 1/3 of the total.

Applying this admittedly rule of thumb technique brings the following probable additional patrons from 'non patron' building benefactors.

- (1) senators - 91.18% of 14* = 13.
- (2) 'equites fonctionels' - 50% of 11 = 6.
- (3) 'equites honorifiques'' - 17.86% of 11 (1/3 of 33) = 2.
- (4) 'sub-equestrians' - 30.95% of 14 (1/3 of 43) = 4
- (5) 'Others' - 11.63% of 212 (1/3 of 637) = 25

*Since these statistics are designed to compare the building activity of local patrons only, 3 non-local senatorial building benefactors have been reduced from the total (see p.150 n.98) for references).

The table below enters these additions to the figures and percentages of table (C) above.

Table (D)

Senators	Eq. F.	Eq. H.	Sub Eq.	Others	% Total
19/92 = 20.65%	9/27 = 33.33%	7/16 = 43.75%	10/30 = 33.33%	32.57 = 56.14%	187.2%

Some idea of the actual proportion that each group formed of the total may now be gained by taking the percentage of the fraction of each individual percentage over the total (187.2%). Comparison of these proportions, and those of table (C) above (derived in the same manner as above, but working on a % total of 104.06%) appears below.

Table (E)

Table	Senators	Eq. F.	Eq. H.	Sub. Eq.	Others
(1) % derived from table (D) - patrons & potential patrons	11.03%	17.805%	23.37%	17.805%	29.99%
(2) % derived from table (C) - verifiable patrons only	7.30%	15.17%	34.32%	22.18%	21.03%

As may be observed from table (E), inclusion of potential patrons with verifiable patrons attested as building benefactors impacts chiefly to the detriment of the proportional representation of the middle-high range of Africa's bourgeoisie, the 'sub-equestrians' and 'equites honorifiques'. Their combined representation has altered from 56.5% to 41.175%. The principal beneficiaries of the inclusion of potential patrons are, in order, the 'Others' (an increase of 8.96%), senators (an increase of 3.67%), and the 'equites fonctionnels' (a similar increase - 2.635%). The pattern of status group representation illustrated by table (E) indicates that private contribution towards civic building for patrons (including potential patrons) and 'non-patrons'

alike, was progressively least likely to derive from the wealthier sectors of the community. This statement requires some modification, however.

While senators and career equestrians appear less frequently as donors of constructions, many of those donations recorded for them were on a particularly grand scale. For senatorial patrons, we may instance the major civic reconstruction funded at Puppit by Caelius Severus (signo) Thoracius (C123), the baths of Memmia at Bulla Regia (C79) and those of L. Octavius Aur[elianus?] Didasius (B192) at Ureu. Other constructions include a temple (B90), a portico (B202) and an unknown building (B137). All those known are recorded in Africa Proconsularis. For 'non-patrons', the most impressive are the library of M. Iulius Quintianus Flavius Rogatianus at Thamugadi (D9362) and the temple of the genius of the colony at Oea by L. Aemilius Frontinus (IRT230). Some idea of the temple's probable high cost may be judged by an accompanying HS 1 million foundation. Both the library and temple were provided 'ex testamento', and the proportion of senatorial donations thus attested is relatively high (4/20 or 20% - the two others being L. Messius Rufinus (Sabratha, IRT29) and Marcius Tertullus the patron of Bulla Regia (B190)). Testamentary benefactions need not, of course, imply that other benefactions did not occur during the testator's lifetime (cf. Pliny's gifts at Comum - Ep. 7.18, C5.5262). Other senatorial constructions funded by 'non-patrons' include temples, basilicae, a portico, and a fountain (cf. p.172 n.31 for references and details).

Two of the three constructions by 'equites fonctionnels' known as patrons are certain to have involved substantial costs, viz. the moenia (public buildings) provided by L. Iunius Iunillus (B200) at Ureu and the macellum given by M. Licinius Rufus (B2) at Thugga. No estimate of outlay is possible for the third construction, a temple at Auzia, given ex voto by Marcellus (B296). The munificence of one 'eques honorifique' not attested as patron was on a singularly impressive scale. Together with his wife, the a militiis M. Plotius Faustus (signo) Sertius provided not only Thamugadi's well-known market (D5579 etc.), but also, it would seem from a recent text (AE(1980) 956), the town's towering Capitolium. The remaining structures

evidenced for 'non patrons' in the 'equites fonctionnels' group comprise five temples or shrines (C1625, 14727, ILAlgI1292, 2035, AE(1946)70), a basilica (C9255) and four unknown buildings (C1578, 4516, 26178, AE(1936)136). The cost of only one of these buildings is known (a modestly priced temple (HS40,000) at Madauros - ILAlgI2035) and no estimate of costs for the others is possible.

In the context of building benefactions dedicated by senators or career equestrians, it has been seen that no meaningful comparison between those constructed by patrons and 'non-patrons' is possible, details of patronate being rarely volunteered by persons of either status group. Even treating all those whose patronate is unmentioned at face value, the brief survey offered above underlines the fact that for both senators and career equestrians, patron and 'non-patron' alike, large-scale as well as modest donations occur. Moreover, neither amongst senators nor career equestrians, is it possible to find buildings erected in the same community by both a patron and a 'non-patron'. Comparison does not permit us to establish whether members of both status groups exhibited a greater tendency to embellish their patria with buildings as a result of co-optation (or conversely, whether munificence of this sort led to co-optation), nor can it be said whether the donations of patrons were more costly or more frequently given than those of their 'non-patron' counterparts. On the other hand, both the low proportion of senators and career equestrians who actually emerge as building constructors (patron or 'non-patron') and the valuable service that their high-level contacts might render the community, suggest that their rôle as material benefactors was of secondary consideration to their capacity to act as intermediaries with the central authorities (cf. R. Duthoy, 'Sens et fonction', p.150). Comparison with patrons and 'non-patrons' from the three lesser status groups is more fruitful, as the following pages will show. All conclusions drawn from comparison of building benefactions must, however, be concluded with the caveat that the benefaction(s) recorded for any one individual may well represent only a part of their total munificence, and that not the most significant. This is almost certainly likely to be the case, for example, where only minor benefactions are known for patrons - statues,

altars, modest distributions of sportulae etc. (cf. list (B), J(1), M(1), P(1), S(2), T(1-3)). Finally, before examination of the other status groups, it should of course, be observed, that the statistics provided in the final tables ((C), (D) and (E) above) represent the minimum level of building activity of Africa's patrons, and that any estimate of their real contribution must remain speculation. The value of the tables rests on the assumption - based on the large quantity of source material available and the broad pattern of distribution by chronology and provenance - that these levels would rise at approximately the same rate for each status group.

(D) The Contribution of Patrons as Benefactors - Building Benefactions and Games.

(b) Patron and 'Non-Patron' Building Benefactors Compared

(1) 'Others'

Like their counterparts not known as patrons, those building benefactors classified as 'Others' embrace not only persons of the decurial class, but also those of unknown rank. One of these, an anonymous donor of an unknown building at Uchi Maius, can be disregarded for comparative purposes, as lacunae in the text may have given him higher status. Two others, however, may be retained, L. Postumius Chius (B13, patron of Thugga) and L. Sinius Caripa (B203, patron of Uzali Sar), as their texts are complete, and omission of status may be taken as an indication that status above decurial rank is unlikely. Another patron from the same status group, L. Marcius Simplex Regillianus (B59), joint contributor of Thugga's Capitolium with a relative (brother?) of higher status (L. Marcius Simplex, B59), has been considered as sharing that status for the purpose of these statistics³⁹. We are, therefore, concerned with only five patrons as building benefactors from three towns. Three patrons are from Thugga and date between the end of the reigns of Tiberius and Hadrian. M. Licinius M.1. Tyrannus (B7) and Q. Maedius Severus (B41), husband and father of flaminicae, were generous temple builders. L. Postumius Chius (B13), seen above, erected a series of public monuments. The two other patrons comprise another temple builder, T. Aelius Lon[ginus?] decurion and patron of Auzia in 210 (B284), and the donor of a fountain at Uzali Sar in the early C5, L. Sinius Caripa (B203 - see above). Only Thugga and Auzia offer comparable building benefactions by 'non-patrons' contemporary with those for patrons⁴⁰.

³⁹ See note (C) to list (E). All buildings in this list whether given by patrons or 'non-patrons' that are jointly donated have been assigned to the donor of the highest rank.

⁴⁰ Four other texts concern building benefactions from Uzali Sar, but all are fragmentary and none reveal the donor's status. One dates to the reign of Hadrian (C10557=14301=L. Maurin, J. Peyras, 'Uzalitana. La Région de l'Anzarine dans l'antiquité', *Cah. de Tun.*, XIX (1971) p.55), the other to an indeterminate time in the C2 or C3 (C10560 = 14307 = L. Maurin, J. Peyras, *op. cit.*, p.56). No date is possible for the other two (C14306 and AE(1973)588 = L. Maurin, J. Peyras, *op. cit.*, p.54).

⁴¹ On this text, see J. Desanges, 'Un curateur de la sauterelle sur la pertica de Carthage en 48-9 de notre ère', *BACTH*, n.s. X-XI B (1974-5) [1978] pp.135-41, T. Kotula, 'Nouvelles observations sur les 'portes' de Thugga et sur les curies municipales en Afrique romaine', *Klio*, LIV (1972) 227-37, and W. Seston, 'Des 'portes' de Thugga à la 'Constitution' de Carthage', *Rev. Hist.*, 237, (1967) pp.277-94.

Five texts concerning 'non-patrons' as benefactors from Thugga, also date between the early C1 and early C2. The erection of two dedications was overseen by patrons (C26475 and 26517), a fact which may imply that at least moderate costs were involved. Costs are unlikely to have been particularly high in the first text, the dedication of a statue by C. Pomponius Restitutus, who supplies no indication of rank or office. The effusive detail offered in the second, however, a dedication to divus Augustus by Iulius Venustus, Thinobae filius, both for his own cursus (honoribus peractis, flamen divi Aug.) and for that of other family members, suggests that a more substantial monument was involved, and the editors of CIL VIII indicate a preference for a temple (C26517 adn. - 'aedem vel statuas dedicavit patronus pagi')⁴¹. The apparent failure of any members of this family to attain co-optation is significant, in view of their evident liberality and importance in society. The latter may be gauged not only by the high municipal offices held by them over three generations, but by the achievements of their descendants - Iulius Faustinus Honoratus (from the male line) continuing in the family tradition as flamen, whilst with more success, five Gabinii (descendants from the female side) acquired the patronate, and in one case (B39) adlection into the equestrian ordo⁴². Of Thugga's three remaining 'non patrons' known as benefactors over the stated period, one, the sufes Felix Dati (filius) Lega fil(ii), donated what appears to have been no more than a statue or altar (AE(1966)509);⁴³ another, an anonymous flamen, an unknown monument (ILT1509); and the third, C. Pompeius Nahanus (status not given) a moderately priced temple of Pietas, given ex testamento (C26493). Only the latter, therefore, is helpful in any degree for comparative purposes, and the gift - as, perhaps, for that provided by Iulius Venustus - was well down in terms of cost on those provided by

⁴² The text to Honoratus is unpublished (cf. C. Poinssot, 'M. Licinius Rufus, patronus pagi et civitatis Thuggensis', BACTH, n.s.V (1969) pp.242-3 n.11). For the Gabinii as patrons, see B38, 39, 40, 66 and 75, all doubtless descendants of the wife of Venustus, Gabinia Felicula.

⁴³ For this text, see C. Poinssot, 'Sufes maior et princeps civitatis Thuggae', Mél. à A. Piganiol, 1966, pp.1267-70.

Thugga's three patrons classed as 'Others'⁴⁴. In Thugga, then, for the years prior to the reign of Pius, the magnitude of a citizen's generosity (or promise of generosity) may have been a critical determining factor in their eligibility for co-optation, at least for persons of decurial or quasi-decurial status⁴⁵. Evidence from the remaining years of the C2 from Thugga, however, indicates that for this period, even exceptional acts of munificence were no longer always deemed sufficient qualification or, perhaps, that those who undertook to perform them opted to waive acceptance of the honour (see below).

The early years of the C3 in Auzia, following her promotion to colonia (193-211), were witness to a considerable upsurge in building activity⁴⁶. In addition to the temple of Caelestis partially constructed by the omnibus honoribus functus and patron, T. Aelius Lon[ginus?] (B284) in 210, and again three years later by the II vir C. Cornelius Aquila (C20744)⁴⁷, other recorded privately funded constructions include diverse architectural fittings for the circus, as well as rostra and an unknown building by the donor Dec. Claudius Iuvenalis Sardicus (rank unknown) in 224-7 (C9065-7); and a temple to dea Bona Valetudo by the flamen L. Cassius Restitutus and his wife in 235 (C20747).⁴⁸ Perhaps to this period too, belong the donation of an exedra 'ob honorem II viratus ... super legitimam summam' by C. Annius Cittinus (C9064),⁴⁹

⁴⁴ The temple of Nahanus, at HS 30,000 was less than half the cost expended by the patron Q. Maedius Severus (B41) on a temple to Fortuna, Venus, Concordia and Mercury at a similar (Hadrianic) date. The numerous benefactions undertaken by M. Licinius M. 1. Tyrannus (B7) and L. Postumius Chius (B13) are likely to have at least attained the sum spent by Maedius (HS 70,000 plus) - cf. list (B) D2, 3 and E2, and D4.

⁴⁵ Thugga's patrons from the same milieu, attested only as providers of more modest benefactions (B36), or not attested at all as benefactors (B32) may be presumed with some confidence to have met their patronal obligations with generosity on a similar scale.

⁴⁶ cf. J.-M. Lassère, 'La colonia Septimia Aurelia Auziensium', *Ktèma*, VI (1981) pp.321 ff., for Auzia's promotion to colonial status, rather than its deduction as a colony. For building activity in Auzia, cf. E. Fentress, 'African Building : Money, Politics and Crisis in Auzia', *The Roman West in the Third Century*, BAR, int. ser. 109 (1981) pp. 199-201, and J. H. Humphrey, 'Roman Circuses. Arenas for Chariot Racing', London, 1986, pp.329-30.

⁴⁷ The temple is interestingly said to have collapsed from age, a mere ten years after Aquila's additions ('templum vetustate dilapsum') testimony, it seems, to shoddy or hasty construction, rather than to damage by earth tremors (C20745).

⁴⁸ Two constructions for the period, where the personal contribution of the dedicating II viri is uncertain, have been disregarded (C20745, and 9062-3), as have the relatively minor donations of tribunals by sacerdotes (C9026, 9027) and persons of unknown rank (C9016), as well as a small shrine given as an ex voto by a couple of unknown rank (C9017).

⁴⁹ The text antedates 268 (by mention of the donor's tribe and filiation) and post dates Auzia's promotion to municipium sometime in the C2 (by Cittinus' rank of II vir). The text is missed by E. Fentress, op. cit., p.201.

unknown building works in the baths by several donors and their wives (C20757)⁵⁰ and a temple to Saturn^{by} the patron and a militiis Marcellus (B296)⁵¹. Leaving aside the patron Marcellus, whose rank of a militiis offered additional inducement for his consideration as patron⁵², the most notable private contributors to Auzia's building programme for this period comprise the omnibus honoribus functus and patron T. Aelius Lon[ginus?] (B284), three other municipal dignitaries (a flamen, C20747, and two II viri, C9064, 20744) and some particularly generous individuals of unknown rank (C9065-7, 20757). While comparative costs for any of the constructions provided are unknown to us, it is significant that in two cases the constructions were the same (temples - C20747 and 20744) and the donors of equivalent municipal status in one instance (II vir - C20744) and superior in the other (flamen - C20747). Given the obviously keen rivalry of competing municipal functionaries in Auzia at this period, and a strong undercurrent of civic munificence evidenced both by non-functionaries acting independently and by the community acting as a whole (cf. C9062-3), the difference in outlay on the temples by the patron Lon[ginus?] and by his fellow municipal office holders is unlikely to have been extreme. Moreover, one may imagine that there was some impetus on the part of C. Cornelius Aquila, the II vir who

⁵⁰ E. Fentress, loc. cit., assigns this text to the reign of Severus Alexander without explanation. H. Jouffroy, op. cit., p.431 does not offer any suggestion as to the date.

⁵¹ A C3 date is almost certain by virtue of Marcellus' position of a militiis (cf. M.G. Jarrett, 'Album', p.146). H. Devijver, 'Prosopographia militiarum equestrium quae fuerunt ab Augusto ad Gallienum', II, Leuven, 1977, M79, suggests 'fortasse medio III s.'.

⁵² For another a militiis as patron of Auzia, cf. Geminius Clemens (B298). Q. Gargilius Martialis (iunior), who rose to the rank of a militiis, was co-opted whilst militiae petitor, if not earlier (C286). Auzia's other patrons, where status is known, are all beneath equestrian status (B284, 293, 299, C285). Despite the relatively low status of Auzia's patrons, two local equestrians from the town's élite appear without the title on non-lacunary dedications. C. Octavius Pudens Caesius Honoratus, procurator of the province (NC20A), was honoured by the Auzienses as both 'praeses incomparabilis' and 'municeps piissimus', and the a militiis P. Aelius Primianus, was described by his son as 'defensor prov(inciae) suae'. J. Gasco suggests that the dedication to Honoratus may have been occasioned by his part in securing Auzia's promotion to colonial status ('La politique municipale de Rome en Afrique du Nord', pp. 208-9). M. Jarrett is almost certainly correct in seeing the defense provided by Primianus as a reference to military action taken whilst praepositus eqq. Maur. (Album, p.151, cf. B. Dobson, 'The Primipilares of the Roman Army', doctoral thesis, Durham 1955, n.15 p.11). The post at this time - the mid C3 - was a dangerous one. This we know from the fate of a contemporary a militiis and occupier of the command, Q. Gargilius Martialis (iunior), patron both of Auzia and of the province of Mauretania Caesariensis. Primianus may also have met a violent end. The services of both Honoratus and Primianus to their community appear to have been exceptional, and their failure to appear as patrons, therefore, all the more extraordinary. That they were not approached by the community to take on the title of patron is difficult to conceive, given that contemporaries of lesser status are found as patrons. The best explanation would appear to be that, affected by the strong civic spirit E. Fentress has observed for Auzia's citizens (op. cit. p.206) the honour of both men was appeased by the gratitude of the population alone.

added to Lon[ginus'?] temple of Caelestis three years later, to meet, if not surpass that generosity. If expectation of generous outlay was the guiding motive behind Lon[ginus'?] co-optation, it is impossible from our vantage point to discern how the cutting off point was determined for other munificent men of comparable status. All the indications from the above evidence, however, suggest that the competition was close.

At this juncture, mention may be made of a text (C9030) concerning a T. Ael(ius) Longinus, fl. pp., om[nibus honoribus functus] in Auzia in the year 201. The text derives from an epistylum, and probably describes a building donated by Longinus. Longinus has been identified with our patron by M. S. Bassignano, but is almost certainly rather to be seen as his brother or father⁵³. Other than the similarity of names (note that our patron may be Lon[gus] as well as Lon[ginus]), and functions (both are described as omnibus honoribus functus), both individuals appear as donors of buildings at a similar date. It is, in fact, the dating of the text referring to the patron, which lies at the heart of the erroneous conflation. This text, dated by the provincial year 171, ought to be assigned to 210, but from what was, perhaps, originally a typing error in C9015, the text has been dated to 200, and this date has been accepted without hesitation by all who have since discussed the text⁵⁴. The text concerning our patron, erected nine years later than that to T. Ael(ius) Longinus, does not describe him as flamen, a post normally held after the completion of one's municipal offices, and so indicated by T. Ael(ius) Longinus. Omission of the office of flamen may be discounted as very unlikely, and no space in the lacuna between the patron's fragmentary cognomen and title of patron permits us to insert it into the text (cf. C9015 - T. Aelius Lon[ginus? col. patr]onus, omnibus honoribus functus')⁵⁵. One must conclude, then, that the patron's recorded benefactions reduce themselves to the construction of the temple of Caelestis, but that he was, on the other hand, one of a

⁵³ 'Il flaminato nelle province romane dell'Africa', Rome, 1974, pp.358-9.

⁵⁴ B. H. Warmington, p.45 n.230; F. Engesser, p.101 n.234; L. Harmand, p.275, 377, 407, M.S. Bassignano, loc. cit., E. Fentress, op. cit., p.201.

⁵⁵ It is also most unlikely, given the descending order of the cursus of T. Ael(ius) Longinus, that the title col. pat. would appear in the lacuna at the end of his cursus.

family of benefactors - 'generosa familia progenitus', as one African text (C897) has it. It may then be, that the concession of the patronate to T. Aelius Lon[ginus?] was intended as a recognition of the family's collective wealth and history of liberality (cf. C. Lepelley, 'Les cités' II p.239 on the patron of Ureu (B192)) and presumably their consequent position among the foremost of the municipal élite. It is, of course, clearly unproven that generosity alone marked T. Aelius Lon[ginus?] out for co-optation, and other factors, including powerful contacts in the capital or abroad, may have assisted in the choice⁵⁶.

The two communities examined above, Thugga and Auzia, present several parallels. Despite chronological differences for the patrons known (all Thugga's patrons date to the C1 - C2, all Auzia's to the C3 - C4, both communities attest only local or neighbouring citizens as patrons, and with one exception from Thugga (B55), are all sub-senatorial. Both communities exhibit high levels of private munificence diverted towards civic constructions, and these are well-documented for patrons and non-patrons alike.

In Thugga, the highest levels of munificence for the years before 138 are recorded for patrons who include persons of relatively low status as well as Carthaginian magistrates and/or equestrians. There is some merit in R. Duthoy's view ('Sens et fonction', p.150) that the former may nevertheless have moved within circles of far more influential people and could thus have benefitted their community by these liaisons. In this regard, it has already been seen (pp.136-41) that an *auctoritas* greater than that suggested by their rank can be premised in some cases by the successful social mobility of their descendants (e.g. the Calpurnii and Marii, B69 and B32), and in another by enrolment in the Carthaginian tribe *Arnensis* (B13). One may doubt, however, whether in the early evolution of Africa's more modest sized communities, their local *ordines* envisaged the same neat division between the functions of *beneficia* and *patrocinia* as those postulated by R. Duthoy (op. cit., p.151).

⁵⁶ No descendants are known by which the family's social mobility may be traced, nor do any T. Aelii from Auzia feature as equestrians or senators. The *militiis* P. Ael(ius) Primianus (C9045) is unlikely to be related.

As the pool of candidates from the highest levels of society remained relatively small for the majority of Africa's numerous communities until the mid C2, it made sense to encourage the ambitions of the decurial class, by awarding the patronate to those best able to serve the community. The examples of building benefaction already noted for persons from this milieu in Thugga, prior to 138, would appear to have exceeded in munificence not only those of 'non-patrons', but also those provided by their counterparts who were equestrian or 'sub -equestrian'⁵⁷. There are some indications then, that a conspicuous financial sacrifice commensurate with the perceived dignity of the title was anticipated from all sought out as patrons in Thugga, but that the pressure of competition from the more numerous members of the decurial class ensured that the contribution of successful candidates from this background would be more generous. One may gauge the intensity of this pressure from the tiny fraction of Africa's building benefactors of the decurial class, or of unknown rank, to emerge as patrons (3.14% cf. table (A)). Even with the addition of potential patrons from lacunary texts (25 cf. p.299) their proportion remains insignificant ($49/765 = 6.41\%$). That successful incumbents from this milieu tended in general to display greater *liberalitas* than patrons from other social groups finds additional statistical support from the far higher proportion they form of all patrons (and potential patrons) known as building benefactors (see tables (D) and (E)).

That benefaction might be viewed - contra R. Duthoy, op. cit., p.151 - as an integral part of patronage, at least by the patrons concerned, may be observed from two Thuggan texts. The first is the unique attestation in Africa (but cf. AE (1914) 116 in Dacia) of beneficia (a statue of Jupiter and a distribution of *sportulae*) specifically said to have been given 'ob honorem patronatus' (B36). It may be argued that the rarity of

⁵⁷ Exact comparison is possible between the father of a flaminica, Q. Maedius Severus (B41), whose expenditure on a temple cost HS70,000, and the contemporary Gabinii (B38, 39, 40) who jointly constructed a temple costing HS50,000 (the Gabinii include an equestrian as well as two local flamens). The cost of the several monuments provided by L. Postumius Chius (B13, rank unknown) is similarly likely to have exceeded that outlaid at this time, or soon after, by the Carthaginian magistrate C. Caesetius Perpetuus (B16). Finally, we may compare the several temples constructed by the patron, M. Licinius M.1. Tyrannus (B7) and his wife (AE (1969-70) 648-651), with the market provided by his equestrian master (B22).

the phrase indicates that donations were not customary⁵⁸ upon the conferment of patronage, or that such 'ob honorem' payments were phased out early (the date is C1). On the other hand, it is clear that for some of Africa's patrons - at least those of the lower-middle range of bourgeoisie - the perceptions of patrocina and beneficia might be blurred.

The second text, erected by Cincius Victor (B45), the father of an equestrian, in the mid C2, implies by the manner in which the sequence of events is recorded, that some of the beneficia he enumerates were given as a result of his co-optation, while other beneficia are directly stated to have been given in consequence of the co-optation of his son. Cincius states that his own co-optation was dependent upon his capacity to render Thugga (legal?) protection - 'cum ad tuendam rempublic(am) suam....iampridem patronus factus esset', while that of his son (B46) derived 'propter eiusdem Cinci Victoris merita'. As the latter phrase follows immediately after details of Cincius' building benefactions and sundry other generosities, we may suspect that these in some measure constituted part of the 'merita' which ensured, or at least expedited the co-optation of his son. The link between Cincius' beneficia and his son's co-optation is further strengthened by the fact that a statue given after the event is said to have been promised. We may similarly suspect that some intimation of Cincius' intended beneficia likewise preceded and influenced the outcome of his own co-optation.

For Auzia, we possess neither such direct confirmations of the link between beneficia and patronage, nor can it be established whether the benefaction of the decurion T. Aelius Lon[ginus?] (B284) was more imposing and costly than those of 'non-patrons' or those of other patrons of superior status, although this appears unlikely. It may be surmised that Lon[ginus'?] capacity to render other services to his patria than the liberalitas attested for him, marked out his eligibility as patron, in particular by

⁵⁸ The phrase 'ob honorem' does not imply obligation. For the distinction between 'ob honorem' payments and summa legitima, cf. R. Duncan-Jones, 'The Economy of the Roman Empire', p.86.

fulfilling the primary function of a patron, as envisaged by R. Duthoy, and interceding on behalf of his client before more powerful authorities.

**(D) The Contribution of Patrons as Benefactors -
Building Benefactions and Games**

(b) Patron and 'Non-Patron' Building Benefactors Compared (2) Sub-Equestrians

Patrons attested as building benefactors from the 'sub-equestrian' group derive in every instance from Thugga (B16, 45, 58, 68) and date between the early C1 to late C2. All the patrons concerned from Thugga were Carthaginian magistrates. Carthaginian offices were also held by two equestrian patrons of Thugga. A. Gabinius Datus filus (B39) was joint donor of temple complexes under Hadrian with his father and brother, patrons classed as 'sub-equestrians' by virtue of this relationship, although they themselves were only local flamens (B38, 40). M. Licinius Rufus, a cavalry commander (B22), provided Thugga's market in the mid C1. Since these men complete the list of Thugga's patrons known as building benefactors, they may conveniently be discussed together with the four Carthaginian magistrates. In chronological order, these last comprise C. Caesetius Perpetuus (B16), donor of an arch in 37-41; an anonymous aedile (B68), who adorned one of Thugga's public places with paving at some date before Pius; Cincius Victor (B45), whose numerous benefactions included restoration of the portico of the temple of Ceres under Marcus; and finally L. Marcius Simplex (B59), joint donor, as seen above, of Thugga's Capitolium in the years 166-9⁵⁹.

Comparison with Thugga's 'non-patrons' of equestrian or 'sub-equestrian' status whose building benefactions are known to us, may begin with two very impressive constructions erected in the late C2 at Thugga by the Carthaginian magistrates P. Marcius Quadratus (C26606-8, 26528-8a, 26465) and Q. Pacuvius Saturus (ILA516-7, 523, C26484). Quadratus' handsome theatre was completed in probably the same year as his brother's Capitolium, and is likely to have consumed as much capital, if not

⁵⁹ Informative accounts of the Capitolium may be derived from C. Poinssot, 'Les ruines de Dougga', Tunis, 1958, pp. 34-8 and I. M. Barton, 'Capitoline Temples in Italy and the Provinces (especially Africa)', ANRW II, 12, 1 (1982) pp.316-7.

more. Some 20 years later, Pacuvius completely transformed the original market of the patron M. Licinius Rufus (B22) and added at its southern flank a temple to Mercury whose final cost attained HS120,000⁶⁰. Despite such considerable outlays, neither man appears as patron on any of the several dedications erected by them to commemorate their work. Quadratus was, at least, equal to his brother in rank and generosity, and surpassed his relative (brother?) L. Marcius Simplex Regillianus in both respects. How then explain his apparent non co-optation?

Let us firstly consider the possibility that (a) Quadratus was in fact patron, but neglected to add this detail to any of the texts commemorating his theatre's construction or that (b) co-optation occurred after the theatre's dedication. The principal difficulty with the first scenario, is that while the dedication of the Capitolium by the other Marcii likewise provides no indication of the donors' patronate, neither of these give any *cursus* at all, whereas Quadratus enumerates the four posts of his *cursus* in every instance. Moreover, of the 12 patrons of Thugga whose patronate is attested on their personal dedications of *beneficia*, eight provide indications of status and/or *cursus*, five of whom were of a status comparable to or higher than that of Quadratus (B16, 22 (1,3), 31, 39(3), 68)⁶¹. The absence of the detail of the patronate for the other Marcii, on the other hand, is simply explicable by the same desire for concision which excluded their *cursus*.

As the only text to name L. Marcius Simplex as patron is that erected to him by the *ordo* 'ob egregiam ei[us munifi]centiam' (C26609) - an undoubted reference to his Capitolium - there is a temptation to similarly attach his co-optation to this time, and by analogy, that of Regillianus (whose patronate is known only by a dedication set up by the *ordo* to his wife, '[in sol]lacium....mariti eius') and Quadratus. While this possibility cannot, in the present state of our evidence, be ruled out, it is, considerably vitiated by the relatively large number of Thugga's patrons (12 - see above) whose

⁶⁰ For the theatre, cf. C. Poinssot, *op. cit.*, pp.27-31, and J.-C. Lachaux, *op. cit.*, pp.133-6. For the temple, cf. C. Poinssot, *op. cit.*, p.33. HS50,000 for the construction was met by Pacuvius' son, 'ob. honorem [flam. perp.]'.

⁶¹ Of the remaining 7, B7, 38 (3-5) and 40(2-5) provide details of status or rank, and B13, 36, 41 and 45 do not.

patronate appears on personal commemorations of their **beneficia**, and presumably antedated them. Although one cannot use this evidence to **deny** the link between the initial granting of patronage in Thugga and the giving of **benefactions** - co-optation in many, if not all of the examples given, being **probably heavily** influenced by advance indications of forthcoming generosity⁶² - it does seem **that** co-optation normally preceded benefaction. There is little to recommend the **view**, then, that three of Thugga's pre-eminent benefactors were anomalous in this **regard**, to at least a dozen patronal precursors and contemporaries.

If Quadratus was not co-opted, can this be attributed to a **consideration** arrived at by the *ordo*, or to a personal decision not to accept the honour? For the latter option, we have, of course, the precedent of Fronto, but then he **could** plead both illness and residence abroad (both apparently on a permanent basis). The liberality of Quadratus was such as to refute any imputation of niggardliness in **his** decision not to become patron, and in this respect we may compare Pliny, whose **prodigious** munificence in his hometown, Comum⁶³ - where he was almost **certainly** not patron⁶⁴ exceeds virtually anything known from Italy,⁶⁵ and is, therefore, **most** unlikely to have been matched by contemporaries from Comum, who were patrons there⁶⁶.

There is no convincing evidence (contra R. Duthoy and J. Nicols - see appendix to this chapter) to suggest that the non-co-optation of Pliny and **of** other munificent Italian senators was necessarily the result of a conscious choice on **the** part of the community. In Africa, where senators are at once far more frequently **found** as patrons and less so as benefactors, the probability that those few honoured by **the** *ordo*, but not attested as

⁶² cf. P.D.A. Garnsey on the pledges (*pollicitationes*) of newly elected magistrates - 'We have to leave open the possibility that all or most pledges were circulated unofficially as **campaign** promises' (*'Taxatio and Pollicitatio'*, p.116).

⁶³ Pliny's gifts include baths, a library and an alimentary scheme (cf. R. Duncan-Jones, 'The Economy of the Roman Empire', pp.17-32).

⁶⁴ cf. J. Nicols, 'Pliny and the Patronage of Communities', *Hermes* CVII, 1980, pp.379 ff. and R. Duthoy, 'Sens et fonction', p.153 contra L. Harmand, pp. 363 n.37, 366, 368, **390** n.11. The critical evidence derives from the honorific text C5.5262=D2927, but also *ex silentio* from Pliny himself (see J. Nicols, *op. cit.*, p.379 n.47 for references).

⁶⁵ cf. R. Duncan-Jones, *op. cit.*, p.31.

⁶⁶ The only attested patron of Comum is the equestrian L. Calpurnius Fabatus (Pliny's grandfather-in-law), whose known benefactions pale besides those of Pliny himself (Ep.5.11). Besides the benefactions of Pliny, the highest priced gift known from Comum is the HS400,000 bequeathed by Pompeius Saturninus (Ep.5.7).

patrons (cf. in particular NB31 and 34), were not approached as potential candidates, would seem even more remote. On the other hand, one might anticipate greater flexibility by local ordines, when considerations of co-optation devolved upon members of the eminent, but less prestigious members of the municipal élite, equestrians and those 'sub-equestrians' nearest to them in rank. While statistical comparison with senators indicates that a markedly higher proportion of senators emerge as patrons, one cannot necessarily conclude that in all cases those immediately beneath them would automatically accept co-optation if sought out. For one thing, the rivalry between members of this social group even in modest sized communities, was often set at a punitive financial pace, and to shoulder in addition the tedious prospect of a continuous call upon one's services as patron, may have been too daunting for some. Again, one might also envisage that a family would consider itself sufficiently honoured and/or financially competent to cope with the obligations, if the honour was held by only one or some members of the family. In the case of the Marcii, we happen to know that both their father and another brother were honoured by the ordo, due to Simplex' munificentia, but neither are termed patron (cf. NB76, 77). Were the non-selection of these family members, and that presumed for Quadratus, the result of deliberation by the Thuggan senate, this would not appear to have been based on any policy of restricting the patronate to a predetermined number of persons from the one family, as three members of the Gabinii, all benefactors, and all of comparable status to the Marcii are found as patrons 30 years earlier (B38, 39, 40). Two other Gabinii (B66, 75 cf. IB45) are also known as patrons at a similar or later date, and other families can be cited with more than one family member as patron in Thugga.

To these considerations, there are also countervailing arguments. Firstly, one cannot discount the possibility that powerful rivals sometimes intervened to dissuade a council from considering some individual's candidature, although this must be deemed unlikely in the case of Quadratus, unless the rivalry here was also fraternal.

Secondly, it has been seen from the album of Timgad, that the number of those admitted to the patronate of an African community might be small indeed and highly

selective. This policy - presumably aimed at deterring all but the most eminent and ambitious from aspiring to the patronate - may have been adopted by a good many more communities. In this regard, we may note the apparent high degree of uniformity in the total of curiae (10-11) for those African towns where this total is given or can be estimated (see p.222 n.10). On the other hand, even if we premise a similar conformity in the number of patrons that each community would permit itself - a conclusion by no means certain - there remains the possibility that this ceiling was not always set so low. That this was far more than a possibility, may be observed by taking three independent lines of circumstantial evidence. If we postulate that at Thamugadi the ceiling was fixed at ten - a figure in accord with the preference for round numbers seen in the division of curiae, and permitting flexibility in expansion (as witness the co-optation of Aelius Iulianus) - this total still attains but a quarter of the presumed ceiling of 40 at Canusium, whose album (the only other complete example known) documents 39 patrons in the early C3 (C9.338). Evidence from two communities in Africa at a similar date - Bulla Regia and Utika - indicates that a ceiling of ten there is far too low an estimate. This may be gauged by the readiness of both to co-opt the wives of patrons, as well as infant children (girls and boys), and indeed what appears to have been blanket concessions of patronage to the dominant *Aradii* gens in the former, (B110, 146, C105A, 106a cf. IB79, 79A, 103, 104) and the simultaneous co-optation of a family of four in the other (C149-52). Finally, three periods in Thugga can be established where the minimum total of patrons was between five and six, AD37-54 (B7, 13, 16, 17, 19-20, 22), 128-61 (B38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 45, 46) and 161-83 (B55, 58, 59, 66, 75?). That the actual total of patrons for these periods is likely to have exceeded ten, may be divined from R. Duncan-Jones' estimate of the ratio of African inscription survival (5.1%)⁶⁷. While appreciating the force of the same author's caution, that 'no general co-efficient of inscription survival can be applied with confidence to any single town',⁶⁸ it may be deemed unlikely that the

⁶⁷ 'The Economy of the Roman Empire', p.362. On these calculations cf. R. P. Saller, *op. cit.*, p.194 n.228, and a more cautious estimate of probably less than 10%.

⁶⁸ *op. cit.*, p.361

survival rate at Thugga would exceed the mean by some tenfold. (A similar disparity would also have to be admitted for Bulla Regia).

It may be concluded from the foregoing, that for three of Africa's communities during the Principate, the minimum total of patrons at any one time, is likely to have exceeded that known from Thamugadi's album by a factor of at least two (and quite possibly more, by analogy with the album of Canusium). The capacity of Thugga, Bulla Regia and Utika to co-opt three or more members of the one family indicate either that the ceiling each community allowed itself was sufficiently large to accommodate additions en bloc, or rather that no ceiling was fixed at all.

If the latter conclusion be accepted, analysis of the relationship between building benefaction and patronage in Thugga nevertheless suggests that here the expanding prosperity and steadily improving social status of its citizens and residents was not matched by a corresponding increase in the rate of co-optation. Patronage and benefaction would seem very much to have gone hand in hand in Thugga, during the first two centuries. The reverse was not always true in the first century, nor in the early years of the second (see above, pp.305-6). In the years between 138 and 205, however, the status and munificence of 'non-patron' benefactors (most notably Quadratus and Satorius) improves dramatically, and corresponds to an equally perceptible increase in munificence by patrons (the Capitulum of the Marcii and the several benefactions (coupled with undefined protection) by Cincius Victor). To the same period also belongs Thugga's first attested senatorial patron (B55) and evidence of the active part played by patrons in the field of legal protection (B55, 57, 75). Further indications of higher levels of wealth within the community and of a munificence more intensely competitive, may be had from three texts whose fragmentary nature prevents determination of patronal rank. Two of the donors erected constructions whose total cost absorbed HS100,000 or more (C26527 (= IB19) and C26498 (cf. 26500)). Their exact status is unknown, but was presumably commensurate with their generosity - i.e. Carthaginian office and/or equestrian rank. The third individual concerned, apparently a Carthaginian magistrate, and tentatively

identified with the patron [-]us Gabinius Octavius Festus Sufetianus (?) (B66), is praised on a dedication by the ordo 'ob eximiam eius liberalitatem' (C26625 cf. ILT1429). Set against this background of more conspicuous spending by Thugga's municipal élite, the evident failure of Quadratus and Saturus to gain co-optation might well be interpreted as a failure by the ordo to absorb more than a modest number of patrons from the expanding pool of prominent and generous dignitaries in its midst. The likelihood that this interpretation is correct gains support from the epigraphic evidence for the following two centuries. This period witnessed a continuance of the same high levels of pronounced generosity by eminent figures⁶⁹. That none of these persons emerge as patron suggests that Thugga's senate remained locked into a policy of not increasing - or increasing only moderately - its intake of candidates as patrons. That no patron at all can be verified for Thugga after 205 (the year of its promotion to colonia) is almost certainly not due to the demise of the institution of patronage here, at a time when it clearly flourished elsewhere in the region. Rather, the solution lies in the growing presence and activity of the senatorial order in Thugga - all unfortunately attested by lacunary or unpublished texts⁷⁰ - and it would seem that it was to this group that the ordo increasingly turned to as patrons.

The move away from co-opting citizens from the decurial classes, as the wealth and prospects of Thugga's citizenry improved, was inevitable. The rival ambitions of those now most eligible for the title continued to ensure that liberalitas remained an intrinsic element in both attaining patronage and in establishing credibility as patrons. The side effect of this emulation was to produce an increasing number of 'non patrons', by no means either inferior in status, or in their capacity and willingness to serve as benefactors or as intermediaries on their patria's behalf. With the growing

⁶⁹ cf. (1) C26582 (= NC8) a legatio undertaken by a f(isci) a(d)vocatus at patrimonium Karthag(inis). (2) C26559 - a portico and an additional payment of HS50,000 to the town by an eques Romanus; (3) ILA541 (=NB88) - a dedication to the son of an e.v. by the ordo; (4 and 5) ILA570; 571 (=NB159,160) - dedications to C. Sadius Africanus (rank unknown) 'ob insignem munificentiam eius et amorem in patriam mult[is] ac magnis documentis declaratum', and to his son (?) 'ob egregiam indolem et summum obsequium in cives patriamq. respondens exemplo familiae ac maior. suor.'; (6) AE(1966) 512 (= NB89) a dedication to the father of an equestrian 'ob aquae curam'; (7) ILA533 the restoration of an aqueduct by an ex curator rei publicae. For benefactions by the decurial classes, cf. ILA539 (=NB132), C26472, ILA527, ILA514.

⁷⁰ cf. IB73, 74, 88, 94?, 115, 123.

incorporation of career equestrians and senators into the numbers of patrons, the bond between material beneficia and patrocina appears to have diminished throughout Africa (see tables (D) and (E)), and the same process of disassociation may be presumed for Thugga.

The acquisition of the highest social status and offices by an increasing number of local citizens, naturally presupposes a prosperous and expanding base of upper echelon bourgeoisie. The continuing readiness of this ambitious class to divest its funds into impressive building projects despite a diminishing expectation of co-optation as a return on their services must to some extent have (a) reduced the traditional association of patronage and liberality and (b) reduced the necessity of those now being preferred as patrons to compete. To what extent the reluctance of career equestrians and senators to spend money on their town was also an outgrowth of their own predisposition towards selfishness, it is difficult to judge. Certainly their reluctance to spend seems real enough. Even granting the fact that patrons from this milieu are principally attested by honorific statues - a medium in which the frequency of non-mention of specific beneficia tended to increase in proportion to rank⁷¹ - the fact that barely 20 senators (and even less career equestrians), patron or not, are found as dedicands of their own benefactions is damning evidence of infrequent liberality. Krause (pp.48-9) conjectures that other services to the community by this élite group, unlikely to have left much trace on the epigraphic record, may offset a negative view of their generosity (as held for instance, by C. Lepelley, 'Les cités' I pp.269 ff., 317 ff.325). If the chief value of patrons of this highest social calibre lay in their capacity to intercede on behalf of their community and to support the privileged group who normally conducted its affairs, one may anticipate certain running costs in oiling the machinery of diplomacy and negotiation. These might at one level be as crude as a bribe, but were more likely to take the form of shouldering any number and variety of

⁷¹ cf. J. Nicols, 'Prefects Patronage and the Administration of Justice', ZPE, 72 (1988) p.214, 'one of the most striking features of patronage is the general reluctance of members of the elite to be specific about their benefactions. This tendency is also a function of rank: the higher the status of patron, the less likely it is that an epigraphical text will specify the benefactions conferred'.

debts for favours owed along the communication chain. It is not recorded whether any personally undertook a *legatio gratuita* (and no African senator is attested as ambassador until the C5)⁷², but the career and affairs of many will have necessitated trips to Rome and opportunities to discreetly achieve results. Even in the first century in Thugga (as presumably in other African communities) when ambitious and generous members of the decurial class attained the distinction of patron, the honour to some extent depended also on services other than those of material benefit, viz. the capacity to liaise with, and through one's children ascend into, more influential circles. The break with traditional demands upon a patron's *liberalitas* came gradually and was rooted in the same advancement of prosperity that the impetus of *liberalitas* had largely created.

(D) The Contribution of Patrons as Benefactors - Building Benefactions and Games

(B) Patron and 'Non-Patron' Building Benefactors Compared

(3) 'Equites Honorifiques'

The five building benefactors of this status who are known as patrons exhibit a wide dispersal chronologically and according to provenance, while their benefactions range from basins (*conchae*) on the one hand (C297, Satafis, mid-end C3) to major civic reconstruction on the other (C266-7, Thamugadi, c367). Between these extremes are the moderately priced temple complex jointly given by A. Gabinius Datus filius (B39, Thugga, 128-38) seen above; an unpriced temple restored by the citizens of Novar[-] in 244 'suis sumpti(bus)' with the (financial?) aid of the patron T. Coelius Mar(tialis) (B287); and an unknown building built at Avedda by M. Munius Primus Optatianus (B91) under Severus (198-211).

A. Gabinius Datus filius' benefaction has already been seen in context with others from Thugga where benefaction appears always to have been an important component of patronage, at least until the late C2. That the equation of equestrian rank and *liberalitas* no longer sufficed to guarantee co-optation by the C3 in Thugga, has been

⁷² viz. Bubulcus (v. sp., comes) in 429, cf. C. Th. XI.1.34, XII.1.186, and Palladius (v. sp., comes) in 445, cf. Nov. Val. XIII.

observed in several instances (see n.69), the most revealing being the gift of a donor of equivalent rank and munificence, [-]s Felix Iulianus in 264 (C26559). Comparison for three of the remaining four building donors attested as patron and of the same rank proves impossible in one instance (B287 - no other private building benefactions are attested from Novar[-]) and meaningless in two others, the donation being either too insignificant (C297 - Satafis) or unknown (B91 - Avedda)⁷³. Some meaningful comparative analysis is, on the other hand, possible for the patron of Thamugadi, Aelius Iulianus, and the text erected to him is in itself of considerable significance.

The tabula patronatus erected to Aelius Iulianus offers incontrovertible proof that co-optation might be directly influenced by the provision of building works, the tabula being proffered 'ob reparationem civitatis'⁷⁴. Iulianus' recent promotion to praesidialis was, however, certainly a large factor in the council's decision (see pp.161-2). The scale of the constructions involved appears to have been considerable (cf. C2388) and probably well above the cost of those donated by the nearest other building donor to Aelius Iulianus in date, C. Statulenus Vitalis Aquilinus, eq. R. and 'non-patron'. (cf. Kolbe, Statthalter, p.40 - the date is 290-3). The achievement of Aelius Iulianus in gaining co-optation may be appreciated when one considers that the almost exactly contemporary album of Timgad admitted only 6 persons as patrons, 5 of whom were clarissimi. Aelius Iulianus features only among the flamines at this juncture, being outranked not only by the patrons, but by another 5 clarissimi, 2 perfectissimi, a sacerdotalis and a curator. It is clear that entry into the patronate at Thamugadi in the mid C4 was jealously guarded, and the preserve of honorati. For honorati beneath the status of clarissimus, co-optation was evidently more difficult, and from the example of Aelius Iulianus, possibly only accomplished by a

⁷³ No benefactions from either town are attested for donors of equivalent rank. Building donations from Avedda are recorded at C14372, ILA437, AE (1973) 601, 604 (date C3), and from Satafis at C20266, 20267 (and Rec. Soc. Const. (1908) pp.280-1) (date C4 - C5), and at (C8389, 20249, 20251). The rank of the donors is in all cases unknown.

⁷⁴ cf. a tabula patronatus erected to Nummia Varia in Peltuinum, Italy 'ea adfectione adque prono animo circa nos agere coepisse pro instituto benevolentiae suae, sicut et parentes eius semper egerunt, ut merito debeat ex consensu universorum patrona praefecturae nostrae fieri, quo magis magisque hoc honore qui est apud (sic) nos potissimus, tantae claritati eius oblato dignatione benignitatis eius, gloriosi et in omnibus tuti ac defensi esse possimus' (C9.3429 = D6110 - AD242).

considerable financial sacrifice. This route to the patronate may be surmised for the only non-clarissimus on the Timgad album, Iul(ius) Paulus Trigetus, sacerdotalis (provinciae Numidiae) (B262). We may further surmise that magnanimity on the grand scale by persons of a similar status had not always been a ticket into Thamugadi's select band of patrons. The extreme generosity of the a militiis, M. Plotius Faustus (signo) Sertius in the early C3, for example, apparently brought with it no such recognition (D5579 etc., AE (1980) 956).

It has already been suggested (pp.156-9) that in Numidia, entry into the patronate by persons of sub-senatorial status owed its début to the special circumstances that availed in the mid C3, and from the C4 too, we may notice a general easing of restrictions in Africa Proconsularis, the primary evidence deriving from two large communities, Madauros (B169, 170, C178) and Thubursicu Numidarum (B199) where patrons of decurial status are known. Both communities flourished in the C4 and did not lack citizens of more privileged status, equestrians and senators⁷⁵. The complete absence of patrons of decurial status from communities of comparable size and status during the latter half of the second and third centuries, would seem to suggest that Madauros and Thubursicu Numidarum likewise adopted a policy, then, of screening out from the selection process all citizens of sub-equestrian status, but later elected to readmit some of their number. No major benefactions can be cited for any of these four decurial patrons, but that their co-optation was to some degree dependent on a heavy financial contribution is highly probable in view of their relatively limited access to influential powerbrokers, able to benefit their town. The high priority placed on munificence in Madauros is suggested by the contribution of an imposing civic construction by a local consularis and patron in the C4 (B202), but we may also note that in general, C4 Africa exhibits a chronic and well-documented dilapidation of existing constructions, whose repair presented an on-going problem. A growing expectation by communities

⁷⁵ Madauros spent large sums in the C4 restoring its baths (ILAlgI2100-2102 cf. 2108-2110) and Thubursicu Numidarum benefitted from a major reconstruction of its forum (ILAlgI1275 - 6 cf. 1229). See C. Lepelley, 'Les cités' II pp. 128-31, 212-13. Representatives of local or neighbouring C4 senatorial families are attested as patrons of Madauros (B202, 168a). Possibly local are the senatorial patrons A175, D197. Senators are known for Thubursicu Numidarum from the C3 (cf. Tituli V p.736 for the Postumii).

that patrons would help to shoulder this burden is reflected by the evidence, 9 patrons being found as building benefactors in the years prior to 138 and 8 in the following century, but 10 in the years thereafter⁷⁶. While these numbers differ only marginally, they are to be seen in a context in which patrons of the earlier and later period are less well represented, as indeed is epigraphy in general for both periods.

We may conclude this long survey of the contribution of Africa's municipal patrons as building benefactors, with the observation that munificence only ceased to become an integral part of municipal patronage in the high imperial period (138-238) - and then not entirely, and that this process of disassociation was dependent upon existing high levels of prosperity that (a) rendered munificence an available option to an expanding circle of the aristocracy and (b) enabled the most ambitious and successful members of this aristocracy to attain distinctions that drew them within the orbit of the empire's most privileged and powerful, and therefore permitted them to render services of an altogether different order.

⁷⁶ ante 138:B7, 13, 16, 22, 38, 39, 40, 41, 68.
138-238:B45, 58, 59, 90, 91, 137, 284, C79.
post 238:B190, 192, 200, 202, 203, 287, 296, C123, 266-7, 297.

(D) The Contribution of Patrons as Benefactors - Building Benefactions and Games (c) Patrons and 'Non-Patrons' as Givers of Spectacles

Discussion must needs be brief, given that only three patrons are recorded as donors of munera. All three donors fall in the late empire, two to the mid-late C4 (C174, Lepcis Magna, 340-50; B179, Thagaste, 370-85) and the other (possibly also C4) to an indeterminate date after 238 (Uchi Maius, B154). The highest recorded status of any of the three belongs to Fl[avius] Victor Calpurnius (C174) [v.p.], praeses prov. Tripol., but this may be misleading. C. Lepelley assumes high rank for the patron of Thagaste [Cor]nelius Romanianus (B179, q.v.), up to and including the clarissime, while the rank, titles as well as name of the third are lost to us (B154). For the first two patrons, certainly, these spectacles, despite their evident extravagance, were only one of a number of manifestations of beneficia. Calpurnius, for example, is also commemorated 'quod eius innumera circa se ac suos officia supra genialis civis affectum', while Romanianus' prodigious displays of munificence included daily banquets to the entire populace and attendant gifts (probably sportulae). The provision of games appears from our evidence to have been but an occasional aspect of patronal activity despite the assured popularity of those willing to incur the expense. The fact, however, that Augustine chooses to head the list of Romanianus' accomplishments with his provision of extravagant and novel games ('munera ursorum et nunquam ibi antea visa spectacula') would support the notion that in the common view, Romanianus' uncommonly fine spectacles and his patronage were closely identified⁷⁷. This is not, however, to gainsay the probability that Romanianus' real value to his community lay in the less tangible services within his capacity as a man of influence with influential friends. The avowed aim of Augustine's homily was to gently chide his friend and dissuade him from his wholehearted hedonism, and in consequence, he unavoidably trivialises the relationship between Romanianus and his community.

The provision of spectacles was a surprisingly uncommon beneficence of Africa's senatorial and equestrian élite. Certainly there is no suggestion that persons of this

⁷⁷ On Romanianus' games, see C. Lepelley, 'Les cités', I pp.298-300 and J.-U. Krause, p.23 and n.110.

distinction were any more reluctant than their fellow citizens to attend the games. Only two of Africa's senators are recorded as having given games⁷⁸. Both are from C2 Tripolitana, and their games were not given in their lifetime but provided ex testamento. Even granting the possibility that as senators, both men were also patrons, it cannot be assumed that (a) their bequests reflect similar generosity in their lifetime or (b) that even if this were so, their willingness to put on games had any bearing on their co-optation. For the two 'equites fonctionnels' also known for their generous munera, neither rank nor liberality sufficed to earn them a position on the patronal rolls, the texts to both men being set up by the ordo or the curiae and without lacunae⁷⁹. The total of other equestrian donors of games is considerably above that for senators and career equestrians (8 examples)⁸⁰. One donor - almost certainly not a patron - provided the costliest African games on record, four days of gladiators and beasts in Carthage, at an outlay of HS238,000 (ILA390 = NB43). The probability that any of the remaining 'equites honorifiques' whose provision of games is known, were also patrons, must be considered remote, given the diminished expectations of this social class as patronal candidates. The same likewise holds for the four 'sub-equestrian' donors of games and the far greater body of munerarii of decurial or unknown status (75 examples)⁸¹. We may conclude that communities generally wished to avoid being seen as having bestowed the patronate frivolously, and in this regard we may note the minimal attestation of banquets, sportulae, gymnasia and theatrical shows given by patrons (cf. list (B) O-R). It may also be significant that with the exception of two supplementary benefactions accompanying the dedication of

⁷⁸ IRT601 (Lepcis Magna), IRT 230 (Oea). Note the unfulfilled pledge of games by a third senator at Cuicul. The donor, Rutilius Saturninus, gave in lieu a basilica (C8324).

⁷⁹ C11340=NB56 (Sufetula), ILAlgI95,96 = NB65 (Gouebar Bou Aoun).

⁸⁰ ILA390=NB43 (Karthago), C11033 (Gigthis), ILAlgI2144 (Madauros), ILAlgI3067 (Theveste), IRT578, 564, 567 (Lepcis Magna). Note the equestrian donor of 'unusual generosity' (R. Duncan-Jones, 'Costs and Outlays', p.111 n.150) who converted money set aside 'pro spectaculo' to provide a costly building (HS300,000) and funds for its embellishment (HS100,000). See ILAlgI876-7=NB63 (M. Amullius Optatus Crementianus, Thagaste, 180-268). The text offers an interesting precedent, some 150-200 years before the lavish spectacles of Romanianus, for a willingness among Thagaste's local aristocracy to expend large sums on games.

⁸¹ See list (G) for references.

monuments by patrons of Thugga (B36, 45), all documented benefactions of games, banquets etc. are of a late date, post dating 238 (B154, 179, 190, C114, 174).

(E) The Contribution of Patrons as Protectors of their Client Community

This function of municipal patrons has generally been viewed as the cornerstone of a patron's obligations⁸². Specific examples, however, are infrequent for patrons, other than governors and imperial officials, for whom this rôle was inherent in their capacity as administrators, patrons or not⁸³. Besides the examples given in list (B) U1-7, the primary evidence relating to Africa derives from Fronto's advice to the decurions of Cirta to seek out as patrons those persons 'qui nunc fori principem locum occupant' (Ad Amicos, II ii). The candidates suggested by Fronto in lieu of himself were all powerful senators connected to Cirta by origo or through marriage, but we may note that our three earliest examples of patrons proffering similar services (all from Thugga) concern persons of equestrian (B57) or possible 'sub-equestrian' status (B45, 75). The capacity of well known and talented rhetors to overcome the disabilities of relatively unimposing status and entrench themselves in the favour of provincial governors and other persons of authority is a commonplace, Cicero being but the best known example. For Africa, we have the evidence of Apuleius breezily addressing the proconsul of Africa as an equal (Florida, 17), and from the evidence for personal clientela in Numidia (cf. P17, 18, 33, 58) advocates appear to have been the members of a community's bourgeoisie most likely to acquire the amicitia of a provincial governor⁸⁴. The prospects of their own social advancement, or that of their children was consequently high, and we may notice in this regard two men of the same stamp,

⁸² cf. Warmington, pp.45-6, Engesser, pp.257-63, Harmand pp.386-96, Duthoy, 'Sens et fonction', pp.148-150.

⁸³ See above for examples of imperial administrators not termed patrons, but equally praised for their iustitia (legal protection) and/or military defence.

⁸⁴ cf. F. Millar, op. cit., p.493 'apart from senators or leading equites and from the different category of soldiers and veterans, literary and scholastic pursuits provided by far the best and most direct means of access to imperial favours'.

both themselves of unknown rank, but fathers of patrons bearing equestrian status⁸⁵. A solid grounding in oratory coupled with the recent or potential acquisition of high status naturally rendered the children of these two men particularly attractive candidates as patrons. One of these children, L. Iunius Iunillus, patron of Ureu (B200), more than repaid the faith placed in him by his community. The dedication to him expatiates upon the 'liberalitas mirabilis' of his building works. Moreover, his elevated rank as v.p., com(es) divini lateris and praeses p(rovinciae) M(auretaniae) C(aesariensis) indicates a chain of connections that may well have proved an even greater embellishment for his community. Among these connections were almost certainly members of the powerful Octavii clan, senators from Ureu to whom Iunillus' maiores had once looked as patrons (cf. P112A). A C4 patron of Ureu, possibly a contemporary of Iunillus, L. Octavius Aur[elianus?] (signo) Didasius (B192), is praised by the ordo for his rôle as protector ('ob [sin]gul[a]rem in prot[e]gendis [civibus?] fidem et paratum [er]ga [o]mn[es] amorem') and one can easily envisage that certain more privileged citizens of Ureu, including the Iunii, benefitted in particular from this protection.

Indeed it is improbable that municipal patrons took care to draw a fine line between the obligations of municipal and personal patrocina. It is not difficult to envisage situations where a request by a patron for certain privileges, nominally for his community, would redound mostly to the benefit of personal amici and clients⁸⁶. Alternatively of course, requests addressed to the governor or emperor, whether personally or through amici, might incorporate a number of matters, some beneficial to a patron's municipal client, others to private individuals. F. Millar (op. cit., p.495) cites the case of the grammarian Alexander from Cottiaeum, whom Aristides says, 'never stopped doing good for relatives, friends, his homeland and other cities.

⁸⁵ Cincius Victor (B45), father of the v.e., M. Cincius Felix Iulianus (B46) and Iunius Publianus, doctissimae memoriae vir, father of the v.p., L. Iunius Iunillus (B200).

⁸⁶ Requests concerning disputes over boundaries, or over grazing or water rights, or again regarding permission to erect or demolish buildings, might all be made ostensibly on a town's behalf, whilst principally benefitting private individuals (or settling scores with their enemies). R. P. Saller also notes that requests concerning the conferment of Latium maius or Latium minus (cf. C22737) exhibit 'the kind of patronage that falls between municipal and personal' (op. cit., p.170).

In the myriad benefits which he conferred on myriads of persons he never asked for payment...'. We may observe firstly, the order in which the beneficiaries are listed and secondly, the unlikelihood that these 'myriad benefits' required myriad trips to the imperial court. Indirectly of course, conferments of status by the emperor upon private individuals, whether at the behest of municipal patrons or others, also tended towards the benefit of the community as a whole, which increased its stocks of prestige and its opportunities to tap deeper into the reserve of imperial resources, the ultimate source of all privilege and wealth. The part played by municipal patrons in expanding the pool of local citizens of social distinction, was by no means the least service in their rôle as protector, in that it perpetuated and multiplied a community's wealth and renown, and at the same time greatly strengthened the institution of municipal patronage itself, by increasing the number and quality of potential patrons.

(E) The Private Clientela of Municipal Patrons

Discussion of the patron's rôle as protector, has unavoidably led us away from those patronal activities which specifically benefitted the community, and on to those whose orbit also encompassed private individuals. The interrelationship was natural, given that beneficia directed to the community as a whole, or to particular aristocrats within it, were seldom mutually exclusive. Inevitably, the very qualifications which marked out individuals as meriting patronage on a municipal level were found equally attractive to private citizens anxious to further their ambitions and fortunes. The extension of beneficia on a personal level was invariably premised either on the prior establishment of bonds of *amicitia* or *patrocinia*, or - less directly - through commendation by friends of friends. R. P. Saller's penetrating evaluation of this topic ('Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire', Cambridge 1982) and particularly his final chapter 'Patronage and provincials: the case of North Africa' (pp.145-204) necessarily provides the framework for much of what follows.

Noting the prominent rôle of governors as municipal patrons, Saller observes, 'one would expect in this capacity too governors would have been open to the initiation of

personal friendships by the town's notables' (op. cit., p.161). In Numidia, the conferment of patronage would appear all too routine, however, to have afforded the prime movers of the legate's co-optation any particular edge in their relationship with him. Such advantages as local Numidian dignitaries enjoyed over their fellow citizens in gaining intimacy with the legate, ^{were} owed rather to a frequency of contact ensured by their social position and municipal functions. Conversely, in Africa Proconsularis, where proconsuls appear to have been co-opted more selectively, selection may in some instances have devolved upon or created the formation of personal ties between the proconsul and local dignitaries. To cite Saller again, 'Whatever the sequence, the existence of a link between private and public patronage is likely owing to the personal nature of the governor's administration' (loc. cit.).

The latitude allowed administrators in making any number of beneficial decisions affecting the welfare of a community, from a favourable judicial pronouncement, to the implementation or approval of civic construction, created an ambivalence in which patronage could both flourish, and its benefits at the same time be attributed to 'good government', to the administrator's *iustitia*, *moderatio*, *aequitas* etc. Only when an administrator also happened to be of local or neighbouring *origo* does our evidence ever permit us to discern any activity or involvement in municipal affairs that may be directly attributed to the fact that he was also patron of the community concerned (see above pp.284-90). A governor's flexibility in matters of conflict of duty similarly enabled distinction between a governor's *beneficia* bestowed as a personal favour and those given in an administrative capacity to become blurred.

Permissible *beneficia* of this sort, enumerated by Saller (pp.152-5), include the scheduling of trials, the acceptance of letters of recommendation as admissible court evidence, and a free hand in the 'equitable' distribution of municipal *munera*, as well as general oversight of municipal finances and building. Add to this list the right of promotion to posts on their military staff and/or the army, as well as the right to recommend promotion to the *ordo* or to equestrian and senatorial offices in the imperial administration (Saller, pp.157-8), and it is not difficult to conceive 'the barrage of

requests' that administrators must have daily faced to meet the ambitions of those seeking their favour (Saller p.164).

In Numidia the evidence for dedications by private clients to legates is primarily concentrated in the legionary headquarters at Lambaesis (45 texts to 18 legates, P8-52). Only 1/5 of the total of such dedications derives from elsewhere (9 texts to 6 legates (2 of whom reappear in Lambaesis, (P6-7, 54-5; P4-7, 54-8)). The recorded distribution of legates with private clientela, therefore, reverses the pattern of those seen with municipal clientela, only two of whom are known as patrons of Lambaesis (A238a and 246) and 28 as patrons elsewhere (A207-12, 217-8, 220-1, 225-31, 233-4a, 237-8, 238b-9, 242-3b, 249, 253-5). This difference is largely negated, however, if one takes out of consideration the military element within the legate's private clientela. This element, naturally enough, dominates our evidence for private clientela from Lambaesis, but appears in none of the nine texts from elsewhere. Their removal, together with the clients recorded on 2 fragmentary dedications (P25, 50), leaves a residue of clientela from the civilian sector (advocates and municipal dignitaries) at Lambaesis only half as large as that attested beyond. The table below illustrates the distribution pattern.

Town	Date	Patron	Status of Client
Lambaesis	246-7	M. Aurelius Cominius Cassianus (P17=A246)	eq. R., advoc.
Lambaesis	246-7	M. Aurelius Cominius Cassianus (P18-A246)	eq. R., [ad]vocat. & II vir & fl. pp.
Lambaesis	213-22	Ti. Iulius Pollienens Auspex (P33)	fratres advocati
Lambaesis	218-22	[-]r[-]us (P52)	[II vi]r qq.
Cirta	C2-C3 (ante 260)	anon. (P4)	(not given)
Diana	194-5	C. Iulius (Scapula) Lepidus Tertullus (P5)	aedil. q. p., praef. i.d.
Diana	184	M. Valerius Maximianus (P6=A233a)	fl. pp. aedil. II vir, II vir quinq. praef. i.d. pro II viris and augur, aedil., II vir
Diana	184	wife of above (P7=A233a)	"
Thamugadi	172-4	son of M. Aemilius Macer Saturninus (P54 = A230b)	(not given, probable grandfather of a consul)
Thamugadi	172-4	brother of above (P55=A230b)	"
Thamugadi	199-201	Q. Anicius Faustus (P56=A238b)	fl. pp., qq. col.
Thamugadi	199-201	Son of above (P57=A238b)	son of above
Thamugadi	c242	T. Iulius Tertullus Antiochus (P58)	eq. R., advocatus

Legates also known as municipal patrons in the same community are distinguished by bold print. It will be seen that the possession of private clientela from the municipal bourgeoisie was as much a feature of municipal patrons as of 'non-patrons'. This is scarcely surprising in view of the fact that the latter were almost certainly municipal patrons as well. The overall evidence for personal clientela from the civilian sector is not large (15 texts) and is not attested earlier than 172-4 (P54-5). Nevertheless, from this date, at least, the banality of the co-existence of municipal and private clientela from the same community may be surmised from the table, given the remarkably even spread in provenance and chronology of the 15 texts at our disposal.

Of interest are the dedications to sons of the legates **M. Aemilius Macer Saturninus** and **Q. Anicius Faustus** in Thamugadi (P54, 55, 57). The formation of client ties with family members of officials by private individuals may indicate - in contrast to the situation for municipal clients - a desire on the client's part to further contact beyond the termination of the officials' administration. I have elsewhere suggested that

personal Numidian connections for Q. Anicius Faustus (e.g. through his Cirtan? sister-in-law, Seia Maxima) may have facilitated future contacts between the Tegenii his Thamugadi clients, and the Anicii⁸⁷. No such bond is known for M. Aemilius Macer Saturninus, but that ties between the Aemilii and their client P. Iunius Iunianus, C. fil. Papiria endured beyond the legate's term of office may be suggested by the fortunate turn taken by Iunianus' descendants, a probable grandson, P. Iulius Iunianus Martialianus (signo) Leontius, being himself Numidian legate and patron of Thamugadi (his patria) 55 years later (C243a)⁸⁸.

Other African officials besides Numidian legates are found honoured by private clients, but none are known as patrons of the community where the dedications were erected, and the clients themselves are generally drawn from the officials' personal staff, or the military forces or civil service under their jurisdiction. Enough exceptions exist, however, to be certain that these officials were courted just as assiduously by the municipal bourgeoisie (P2 (cf. M. Torelli, *op. cit.*, p.288), 64, 153, 156, 157 cf. P1, 3, 154) and ambitious advocates (P65, 72, 97)⁸⁹, and we may anticipate that municipal and personal patronage co-existed with some frequency⁹⁰.

Members of Africa's great (and not so great) houses, of course, also had patronal resources that communities or citizens might draw upon. Their recommendations might bring successful conclusions to the petitions of either through the nexus of contacts at their disposal. For private clientela, the effect of a patron's commendation might mean advancement to equestrian or senatorial status - the probable services of Fronto in this regard for fellow Cirtans have been examined by E. Champlin and R. P.

⁸⁷ P. I. Wilkins, 'The African Anicii - A Neglected Text and a New Genealogy', *Chiron*, 18, 1988, pp.378-9.

⁸⁸ Martialianus' cursus does not indicate adlection, which must be presumed for his father (P. Iulius Iunianus' son or nephew?).

⁸⁹ In Carthage, cf. for example Apuleius, *Florida*, 17.

⁹⁰ A likely example is the proconsul M. Atilius Metilius Bradua, patron of four citizens (probably magistrates - cf. M. Torelli, *loc. cit.*) in Lepcis Magna (P2). Lepcis Magna was a major assize centre and easily the best attested client community of proconsuls of Africa. Note in this connection three personal clients of local men (in at least two cases - P72, 158) who describe themselves as 'candidatus eius'. In one instance the protégé's elevation (to f(isci) a(d)vocatus) may however, have^{been} owed to the fact that this patron (P72) was also an imperial official serving in the province (proc. prov. Numidia). In another, the promotion (not specified) came through the good offices of a local senator from Utika (P158) holding no African post. The third example suggests that the promotion was to b(ene)f(iciarius) cos.. The patron is anonymous and his rank, origo and status unknown (P151).

Saller⁹¹ - the favourable settlement of a dispute, or assistance in their private affairs (negotia)⁹².

Municipal patrons of local origo (or residence, cf. B102=P100) who also double as private patrons, are somewhat more numerous than their official counterparts (6⁹³ cf.4), and this total almost doubles if allowance is made for the four-five municipal patrons with personal clients in the locale⁹⁴. Most of our evidence relates to Cirta, where four of the six senators honoured by local clients were also known as patroni patriae (P116, 118-21 cf. P117, 160). The high eligibility of all senators as potential patroni patriae, however, suggests that most of the 'non-patrons' honoured by private clients would in any case have also been municipal patrons. Those clients of senators who do denote their status (the majority do not) include local municipal office holders (P104, 122, 126, 160), equestrians (P102, 104, 117, 119, 123, 125, 129, 162 (cf. 161) cf. 145, 147, 149), military officers beneath equestrian rank (P116, 128, 161 cf. 162)), and even a college of priests (P103, cf. 144 and C160). Promotion of some of those attested as equestrians through the commendatio of their patrons may be considered probable. The promotion of [D]urmius Felix (P119) to the primipilate through the offices of his patron P. Iulius Geminius Marcianus (also patron of Cirta) may be regarded as extremely likely, Felix being '[(centurio) st]rator in Arabia Maioris [te]mporis legationis eius'⁹⁵.

Private clients of equestrians and municipal magistrates appear less frequently as dedicands. The status of most is again generally undeclared. Two clients of

⁹¹ E. Champlin, 'Fronto and Antonine Rome', Harvard, 1980, 13 ff., R. P. Saller, op. cit., p.181 cf. 172.

⁹² cf. R. P. Saller, op. cit., p.158-9, n.64 and p.163 citing Fronto, Ad Amicos 1.9. Fronto placed a request to Caelius Optatus to assist a certain Sardius Saturninus (a Cirtan?) with his negotium.

⁹³ Calama (B102=P100), Cirta (B232 = P116, B219 = P118, B223-4 = P119, B215-6 = P120-121), Thugga (B38 = P138).

⁹⁴ Three of the five were, however, also administrators in Africa viz. C94 patron of Thagaste with private clients (?) in his patria civitas Maracitanus (P62); C116 patron of Avioccala with private clients in Thuburbo Maius (P111); C78 patron of Bulla Regia with private clients in Vina (P154). The other is B295, patron of civitas [N?]epesinorum (cf. P134 in Caesarea). A fifth possibility is the c.p., L. Naevius Flavius Iulianus Tertullus Aquilinus who would seem (contra Tituli V pp.735-6) to be a native of Hippo Regius by virtue of the dedication to him there by a private client (P102). He is generally taken to be the same, as the anonymous son and legate of the proconsul L. Naevius Aquilinus, who shared the patronate of Thubursicu Bure with his father and brother (A120-122).

⁹⁵ cf. B. Dobson, 'The Primipilares', n. 192 p.140, and 'Die Primipilares', n.145 p.263, 'Felix...erreichte den Primipilat, zweifellos auf Empfehlung des Marcianus, noch unter ihm oder Kurz nach seinem Abschied.'

equestrians (both 'honorifiques') derive from the decurial classes (P132, 163). The patron of one (P132) clearly had access to persons with influence in Rome, since his son appears with senatorial insignia (c.i.). The client is at particular pains to stress his expectations of continuous gratia from a family whose prospects were so evidently on the rise ('iusto viro ob notissimam omnibus in se bonitatem qua in perpetuum est reservatus' - cf. P166). The attachment of persons of the decurial class to equestrian patrons not entered on a career may generally be held to indicate that the patron had resources and contacts not to be measured by his status alone. No equestrians can be found from Africa with private clientela in a community also 'in fidem clientelam'⁹⁶, nor can predictions of municipal patronage be made for equestrians in those towns where private clientela are recorded, even where those clients are of decurial status. The reverse, however, is not true. We must imagine that the measure of success in any community was at least partly dependent upon the size of a person's retinue. The merits that secured municipal patronage may well have ^{been} owed in some measure to lobbying from personal clientela, particularly if those clients also happened to be seated on the local senate.

Lobbying of this kind may well have been a factor in the co-optation of Q. Gabinius Datus, a flamen and patron of Thugga (B38), and the only municipal patron from the decurial classes known to have been honoured by private clients. These clients, the conductores praediorum regionis Thuggensis (P138) benefitted from unspecified 'm(erita)' of Gabinius. The date (Hadrianic) coincides with that for documents from the same region (Hr. Mettich (C25902), Aïn-el-Djemala (C25943)⁹⁷ which indicate that legal bickering over the respective rights of conductores and coloni eventually ended in a compromise, conductores gaining compensation for damage to the crops of coloni, who in turn were permitted the right to occupy undeveloped lands (subseciva)

⁹⁶ But cf. C94 patron of Thagaste, with personal clientela in his patria (P62) and Cirta (P70), and B295 patron of civitas [N?]epesinorum with private clientela in Caesarea. The first was a procurator, the second a commentarius.

⁹⁷ cf. another text, C26416, from Aïn Wassel, of Severan date, which reiterates the sermo procuratorum from Aïn-el-Djemala.

on good terms⁹⁸. Gabinius' 'm(erita)' may well have involved legal assistance or personal support through friends to ensure that the outcome in this or a similar dispute went at least part of the way towards satisfying the conductores' complaints⁹⁹. The capacity of the conductores to repay Gabinius' gratia other than by the formality of an honorific statue is suggested by the cosy collusion of procuratores and conductores revealed in the well-known text from saltus Burunitanus (C14464 cf. 14428, 14451, ILAlgI3992). Although of sub-decurial status, they were evidently an influential group en bloc.

(F) Reciprocity - The Nature of the Return

The capacity of private clientela to make some return on the officia or beneficia experienced by patrons may serve as a convenient point of departure for examining the quid pro quo entailed in compacts of municipal patronage, 'the reciprocity ethic which is the sine qua non of patronal societies' (Saller, op. cit., p.15). The nature of the return by private clients has been well-documented by Saller. Governors, he notes, were accorded considerable leeway both to bestow 'the things appropriate to friends which faith and scruples of conscience allow a proconsul to distribute without harm to others'¹⁰⁰ and to make their own interpretation of what was an acceptable return. The latter might legitimately include small to 'moderate' gifts (xenia) from the reign of Severus, if not earlier¹⁰¹ and lodgings and entertainment from generous hosts on the assize circuit until the late C4¹⁰². Governors might further anticipate aid in court from their clients in the event of prosecution for misgovernment at the end of their office¹⁰³.

⁹⁸ cf. D. Kehoe, 'Lease Regulations for Imperial Estates in North Africa', II, ZPE, 59 (1985) pp. 151-4 and 169, and cf. D. Kehoe 'Lease Regulations for Imperial Estates in North Africa', I, ZPE, 56 (1984) 193-219.

⁹⁹ cf. P143, a dedication by forenses to an aedile, son of a flaminial(s) vir p[ri]p[ri]s, 'ob honorem patris eius'.

¹⁰⁰ The words are Marcus Aurelius' (Fronto, ad M. Caes. 5,36), cf. R. Saller, op. cit., pp.32 and 164.

¹⁰¹ Dig. I.16.6.3 cf. G. Burton, 'Powers and Functions of Proconsuls in the Roman Empire, 70-260 AD' (unpublished Oxford D. Phil. diss., 1973) p.26 and R. Saller, op. cit., p.165 and n.99. Illegal in 103 (cf. Pliny, Ep. 4.9 and R. Saller, op. cit., p.165 n.98) the legality of xenia may have taken effect between this date and Ulpian's entry in the Digest. See also Dig. I.18.18.

¹⁰² cf. G. Burton, op. cit., pp.25-7 and R. Saller, op. cit. p.160. The ban took effect in 369 (C. Th. I. 16.12, cf. J. Matthews, op. cit., p.29).

¹⁰³ cf. R. Saller, op. cit., pp.165-6.

Similar gifts and services, equally permissible, may be anticipated from municipal clients. The ruling mentioned by Ulpian permitting acceptance of *xenia*, for example, makes no distinction as to the donor (Dig. I.16.6.3).

To comply with the description '*xenia*' (gifts made to guests) rather than '*dona*', acceptance of which by administrators remained forbidden by the *lex Iulia repetundarum*, gifts to governors were presumably normally made whilst in lodgings outside the capital. While governors and their retinue were apparently normally quartered in private villas whilst on tour of the province, the designation of quarters and at least part of the bill for *hospitium* appears to have been a municipal *munus*. The long-suffering villagers of Scaptopara, for example, provided for the authorities' stay in their village 'as needs we must' ('καὶ τὰς μὲν ἐξουσίας συν(εχ)έστατα δεχόμεθα κατὰ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον' – C3.12336, 11.47-8)¹⁰⁴.

Gifts proffered to governors during their stay by local senates might, therefore, be excused as *xenia* on these grounds.

As to the style of accommodation and hospitality provided visiting governors, Philostratus and Plutarch confirm what one might expect. The former relates how the future emperor Antoninus Pius took up residence at Smyrna whilst proconsul of Asia in the villa of the orator Polemo, 'since it was the best in Smyrna and belonged to the best man'¹⁰⁵. Plutarch notes that selection of guests at a dinner for the governor must needs fit the occasion¹⁰⁶ and it goes without saying that the entertainment would accord with both the surroundings and the stature of the guests. The anecdote of Philostratus goes on to explain how Antoninus had to move residence that night when Polemo, who had been away while his villa was occupied, returned and trumpeted his

¹⁰⁴ cf. F.F. Abbot and A.C. Johnson 'Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire', New York, 1968, n.139 (cf. p. 471 for the view that the village was on an imperial estate).

¹⁰⁵ V.S. 534, cited by G. Burton, op. cit., p.27 and n.93.

¹⁰⁶ Quaest. Conviv. 679C, cited *ibid.*. For other indications of private villas used as accommodation by governors cf. Plutarch, *De exilio* 620C, 640B, Pliny, Ep. X81 and Forsch. Eph. 4.3. no.30, all cited by G. Burton, loc. cit.

disapproval. Philostratus' tale is our best clue as to the protocol behind the arrangements for a governor's visit. Obviously Polemo's outburst of indignation indicates that the decision to quarter Antoninus in his villa came either from Antoninus himself, or from the Smyrnan magistrates. The first option would appear ruled out by Antoninus' decision to evacuate Polemo's villa in compliance with the owner's wishes. If governors had a mandate to reside wherever they chose on their tours - and one cannot imagine Antoninus voluntarily electing to reside in a villa, without such a mandate - Antoninus was clearly under no obligation to move out. That Antoninus elected to waive his mandate to reside where he chose, in friendly deference to Polemo, is disproved by the rupture in relations between the two after the incident. The responsibility would thus appear to have been taken by the magistrates of Smyrna, Polemo's villa being chosen not from any long standing arrangement, but presumably by the mutual consent of the senators in the curia that day. That the choice of accommodation for visiting governors should be made dependent upon the formal decision of the town's magistrates on each separate visit, rather than upon any strict adherence to a set protocol, afforded the community two advantages. Firstly it diminished the likelihood that the rôle of host would become either the monopoly (or conversely, the burden) of any one family. Secondly it permitted the *ordo* to differentiate the measure of their appreciation for different governors, Antoninus in the above incident getting preferential treatment (albeit briefly)¹⁰⁷. We may, therefore, legitimately speculate that such governors as were municipal patrons might similarly be reserved the best appointed villas, and the hospitality itself be garnished with additional attentions.

In the early C3 two rulings attempted to moderate abuses in this area. Ulpian (Dig I. 16,4) cites a stipulation that a proconsul ought 'not overburden the province through too lavish hospitality' (*ne in hospitiiis praebendis oneret provinciam*). Callistratus

¹⁰⁷ Antoninus' decision to abide by Polemo's wish that he depart his villa is best explained either by a desire not to inflame local feeling by intervening in a dispute between the *ordo* and Polemo which lay outside his jurisdiction or by the realisation that intervention, while within his range of options, would not, because of his partiality in the case, redound to his credit.

gives a related ruling couched in equally loose language (Dig. I. 18.19) - 'it is added to warrants of appointment that provincial governors ('*praesides*') shall not admit citizens of the province into too close familiarity' ('*in ulteriorem familiaritatem*'). The latitude of interpretation in both rulings was unlikely to make noticeable inroads into accepted practice, and this may be confirmed by Forsch. Eph. 4.3. no.30¹⁰⁸. Not until an edict of 369 (C.Th.I.16.12) do we hear of the express restriction of a governor's travelling accommodation to the post stations (*mansiones*) enroute, or of the interdiction of the pleasures of delightful retreats ('*deverticula deliciosa*').

Our evidence for charges of maladministration against governors would suggest that these charges were normally levelled by delegates selected for this purpose by provincial concilia or koina. Five well-known examples will suffice to illustrate continuity of the practice at the provincial level over a period of four centuries -

- (1) the province of Sicily against Verres (Cicero, *In C. Verrem*) - 70 BC.
- (2) the province of Asia against C. Iunius Silanus (Tacitus, *Ann.* III 66-9) - AD 22.
- (3) the province of Africa against Marius Priscus (Pliny, *Ep.* II 11) - 100.
- (4) the *tres provinciae Galliae* against Claudius Paulinus (C13.3162) - 238.
- (5) the province of Tripolitana against comes Romanus (Amm. 28.6) - 366.

On the other hand, while occasional (and equally well known) examples of charges laid against officials can be documented for small communities on imperial estates (e.g. *saltus Burunitanus*, Africa, C14464 - AD186; *Scaptopara*, Thrace, C3.12336 - AD238), F. Millar can cite only one example of such accusations brought at the municipal level beyond the Julio - Claudian era, and that dubious (*op. cit.*, pp.443-4 and n.44)¹⁰⁹.

The rôle played by towns in forwarding delegations to Rome to praise the actions of governors, is somewhat better known. The evidence for these *testimonia* is both

¹⁰⁸ See n.106. The text concerns the anonymous host of a procurator of the *praefectus annonae* in Ephesus.

¹⁰⁹ The example, apparently from Alexandria (the date is 103-7) derives from the dubiously historical 'Acts of the Pagan Martyrs' VII (cf. F. Millar, *op. cit.*, p.444 n.44 and pp.234-5). The evidence from the Julio-Claudian era again concerns Alexandria, but Philo, who provides the information, indicates that the practice was common under Augustus and Tiberius (In Flaccum 12/105-6; 13/108 -18/151, cf. F. Millar, *op. cit.*, p.443 n.43).

epigraphic and literary. F. Millar gives as illustration three texts from communities as diverse as the Vanacini (Corsica), Stratoniceia - Hadrianopolis (Asia) and Sala (Mauretania Tingitana)¹¹⁰. The texts fall chronologically between the reigns of Vespasian and Pius. The salutary effect such testimonia might have on future appointments determined by the emperor is suggested by Pliny (Paneg. 70)¹¹¹, although the recommendations of amici and 'those coaxed out of city factions' (loc. cit.) continued to make their mark¹¹². The right of provincial councils, on the other hand, to forward similar testimonials and votes of thanks, was apparently permanently revoked after a ruling of Nero's in 62 (Tacitus, Ann. XV 21-22)¹¹³. In these circumstances the testimonials of cities obviously gained a new importance and were presumably solicited with a corresponding zeal (cf. *ibid.*, 21). This appears to be supported by the chronological distribution of municipal testimonia (all post AD62). Governors must at all times, however, have been aware of the dangers of overtly antagonising the municipal aristocracy of the key communities under their jurisdiction, given the opportunity for their delegates to take revenge at the annual provincial assemblies by recommending that accusations be levelled at Rome. In this regard, the marble of Thorigny provides the classic instance of how a sympathetic delegate might dissuade other members of the assembly from pressing for a suit (C13.3162)¹¹⁴. The delegate concerned, T. Sennius Sollemnis, also happened to be a client of the governor he was defending (Claudius Paulinus), but he represented that his town (civitas Viducassium) stood behind him in the matter, and that far from instructing him to press charges, had nothing but praise for Paulinus. The interest of the case from our viewpoint is the revelation that a private client of a governor might act in collusion

¹¹⁰ *op. cit.*, p.348, 380-1, 419, 435 (cf. C10.8038, IGR IV1156, IAM, 307). A possible fourth example from Bergomum, Italia (C2?), C5.5127 is also cited by F. Millar, *op. cit.*, p.419 n.45.

¹¹¹ cf. F. Millar, *op. cit.*, pp.347-8 and n.41.

¹¹² cf. also Dio of Prusa, Or. 38.36 f. and 39.4, Philostratus, Apoll. 6.38 and C.P. Jones, 'The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom', London, 1978, ch. 10 (cited by Saller, *op. cit.*, p.165 n.103).

¹¹³ cf. *ibid.*, p.348 for the suggestion that the testimonia of provinces may have continued, but were now addressed before the emperor, not the senate.

¹¹⁴ Pliny, Ep. VII 6 (cf. VI13) affords another instance of a split among the provincial delegates as to the wisdom of proceeding with prosecution. See H. G. Pflaum, 'Le marbre de Thorigny', Paris, 1948, for the political background, and cf. R. P. Saller, *op. cit.* pp.132-3.

with a community - in all probability also entered into the governor's clientela - thereby earning the governor's gratia - and in the case of Sollemnis, at least - handsome remuneration¹¹⁵. The favour rendered Paulinus by Sollemnis' patria was twofold. In the first place the community broke ranks with its neighbours by not consenting to the prosecution of Paulinus. Secondly their delegate at the assembly, Sollemnis, evidently gave an oratio praising Paulinus on the town's behalf. It is possible that Sollemnis also had instructions to deliver the oratio at Rome, as a testimonial¹¹⁶. Until 62 delegates from the provincial assembly had registered their votes of thanks in Rome, sometime after the assembly had concluded. The testimonia we hear of by individual communities after this date, while lacking the impact of provincial expressions of gratitude, fulfilled much the same function, and like them would be delivered as soon as legitimately possible after the official had quit office. The tradition of employing the same delegates as envoys to Rome may, therefore, have continued.

Be that as it may, it is clear that a community might render a former governor no small service by a spirited defence of his conduct at the annual provincial assemblies, and/or before the emperor himself in Rome. Of the three beneficia so far envisaged as being within a community's capacity to bestow upon officials - xenia, 'five star' hospitium and testimonia (at the provincial or imperial level) - the last clearly was the ace in the deck. The value of this resource in the eyes of the officials themselves may be judged by the generosity of the governors Clodius Paulinus and Aedinius Iulianus towards Sollemnis (and one suspects through him - or more directly - towards the community he represented), and, retrospectively, from Tacitus (Ann. XV 21).

The potential of a community to benefit a governor after his term of office had expired has obvious ramifications for our understanding of the nature of reciprocity in municipal patronage. To begin with, it is inherently unlikely that a community bound

¹¹⁵ Sollemnis received promotion to the rank of tribunus semestris, his salary in advance and sundry costly gifts.

¹¹⁶ Note that Sollemnis later made a trip to Rome on his own behalf to gain the recommendation of Paulinus' successor, his patronus Aedinius Iulianus. Sollemnis' private errand may well have followed upon the completion of his official business in Rome as envoy on his town's behalf. If part of this mission was to deliver a formal testimonium of Aedinius Iulianus, the latter would have additional reason to treat Sollemnis' request with favour.

to a governor by ties of clientship, would initiate prosecutions once his administration had ceased. It is again highly probable - if not provable - that client communities had an additional incentive to deliver formal testimonia to the emperor. It is possible, for example, that some of the delegations entrusted with the task of travelling to their patron's residence abroad and presenting them with a statue (cf. A8, 9-9c, 50, 67, 164-164e, 301) were also engaged on an embassy to the emperor to formally praise their patron's conduct. Unfortunately the circumstantial nature of the evidence precludes us from knowing to what extent testimonia ever became morally binding.

Testimonials delivered by cities before the emperor were by no means reserved for former governors. F. Millar cites examples of Lycian cities sending deputations to praise a local benefactor, Opramoas, and notes that an Italian city, Tergeste, was deterred only by the modesty (*verecundia*) of the senator L. Fabius Severus from following suit¹¹⁷. Communities were equally at liberty to bring recriminations before the emperor against local citizens, including tall poppies. The accusations levelled against Herodes Atticus by the Athenians (Philostratus, V.S. II, I (559-63)) are the most notorious instance, but Millar, citing Seneca (Controv. VII, 5, 12), also adduces the charges preferred against a local orator by the city of Narbo 'apud Caesarem'¹¹⁸. Accusations before provincial governors were, of course, even more frequent. Well-known are the suits brought by Smyrna against Aelius Aristides and by Prusa against Dio Chrysostom¹¹⁹.

Municipal patronage presumably offered security from prosecutions launched by their client, or by hostile factions within it¹²⁰. In this regard, Lepelley draws attention to a statue erected to a local patron at Membressa, Calicius Honoratianus (B184-5). Its erection, requiring two municipal decrees and two proconsular interventions, was evidently the focus of a local dispute ('*Les cités*', II p.143 and n.9). Honoratianus

¹¹⁷ *op cit.*, p.420, citing IGR III 739 and D6680.

¹¹⁸ *ibid.*, p.443 n.40 and cf. pp.4-5.

¹¹⁹ Aristides, Or. 50, 85 ff., Dio Chrysostom, Or. 40, 5 ff. (both before the proconsul of Asia) - cf. G. Burton, *op. cit.*, pp.43 and 49.

¹²⁰ On the theme of security from the attacks of enemies, cf. Augustine (*contra Academicos* I. 1.2) addressing the patron Romanianus (B179) - 'if no one would dare to be your enemy' ('*si nemo tibi auderet esse inimicus*').

clearly had some powerful and determined rivals who were anxious to prevent his co-optation. To the advantages to be derived from tenure of the patronate already enumerated, it seems one can add the pleasure of outdoing one's rivals and enemies. This brings us to the attraction in terms of prestige, that the title of patron held out for the local nobility, and - to a lesser extent - to non-local administrators. For the latter, the increment in prestige upon the already considerable 'auctoritas' derived from their office, is unlikely to have been significant or to have lasted beyond the term of their governorship. Even without recourse to extra-judicial means to effect his will, the capacity of a governor to injure a community or its leading citizens, if provoked by defiant or capricious behaviour¹²¹, was at all times greater than their collective power to injure him. Burton, for example, cites the case of Sparta, a free city, whose privilege of freedom was revoked by Nero, on receipt of advice from the proconsul of Achaëa, critical of the conduct of its senate¹²². For the vast majority of communities who lacked a charter of independence, governors had ample means at their disposal to make life miserable if they were so minded. One has only to think of their general judicial authority, or their capacity to investigate a community's finances and to inspect its public buildings. Moreover, to cite Burton, 'from the Flavian period onwards' governors were 'constantly involved in the electoral processes of cities'¹²³. Ulpian refers to the frequency of governor's commendations on behalf of honours or munera for this or that individual and urges the necessity of governors to distribute the same equitably ('aequaliter')¹²⁴. It was simply good sense to establish good relations with governors, although the depth of feeling between rival factions within a community - or for that matter, between one community and another - sometimes made this impossible. Good relations between administrators and communities under their jurisdiction were by no means reserved to those bound by a treaty of patronage, as has already been seen in Africa for administrators honoured by various communities but

¹²¹ An extreme example from Africa, occurred when the future emperor Vespasian, was pelted with turnips at Hadrumetum, whilst proconsul (Suet. Vesp. 4).

¹²² *op. cit.*, p.125 citing Philostratus, *vita Apoll.* 4.33.

¹²³ *ibid.*, pp. 73-4 and see in general *ibid.*, ch. III.

¹²⁴ Dig. XXXVIII 4. 1. 3 ff., L.4.3.15 and cf. G. Burton, *op. cit.*, p.66.

not stated to have been patrons (NA1-3, 5-6a, 9, 11-15, 18, 21). It has also been seen that where the services or merita rendered by these governors are mentioned, there are no ready means to distinguish them from those of their peers whose co-optation is documented. While patronage presupposes a return, we are unable to compare the gradations in protocol appropriate to a governor who was patron with those to a governor with whom a community enjoyed cordial relations but not the formal ties of clientship.

The permanent and closer ties of local patrons with their client communities would indicate that the consequent prestige attached to the title was of an altogether different order. As R. Duthoy properly observes (*'Sens et Fonction'*, p.151) the attraction is not to be measured in the outward manifestations of deference - statues, bigae and the like - but in the deference itself, in the explicit, formal and permanent public recognition of the patron's superiority. This public recognition served, incidentally, to reinforce the patron's innate conviction of his own superiority and that of the social class he represented (*ibid.*, p.152). This superiority was recognised at one level by assigning the patron a superior position on the municipal album both to that of his peers who had not been co-opted, and, of course, to that of persons of inferior social status, patrons or not¹²⁵. The position a patron occupied on the album among his peers who were also patron - a position determined by length of tenure of the clarissime - may also have been a source of some satisfaction, and even, perhaps, privilege. It is quite possible, for example, that the most senior patron on the roll enjoyed the prerogative of addressing the local senate first, when the meeting was called to order. We might likewise imagine that the opinions of patrons in general tended to take precedence over those of their colleagues on the album who were not patron. Unfortunately, our evidence of this sort of participation in Africa reduces itself to one text, a proposal given by an anonymous clarissimus patron and II vir qq. in the curia of Carthage, to award a statue to his duumviral colleague to commemorate his generous spectacles in

¹²⁵ The social hierarchy was not disturbed by possession of the patronate, as may readily be observed from the Album of Tingad - 'non patron' clarissimi outranking the sacerdotalis dignified with the patronate.

the amphitheatre (B186). Besides the banal nature of the proposal, there seems no compelling reason to attach any significance to the fact that its proposer was patron as well as duumvir.

The precise privileges attached to the title of patron elude us. That they existed is suggested by Augustine's homily to Romanianus, patron of Thagaste (B179) - 'statues would be erected, honours would be pouring in, rare privileges ('potestates') would be showered on you by municipalities' (see in full below, pp.344-5). We are reduced to speculation on many fundamental aspects of the relations between patron and client. Thus, we know nothing of the nature or procedures of the ceremony of co-optation, nor whether patrons were then or later distinguished by dress or whether the title was insisted upon on all formal occasions. Again we do not know whether patrons were designated particular seats in the theatre, or whether an established protocol determined their priority in religious festivals, public banquets or meetings of the senate. If the actual procedures of conduct adopted by clients are unknown to us, we are at least possessed of some sensation of both the mood and general tenor of the ritual and adulation surrounding a patron, and can appreciate the reality of the '*profonde satisfaction morale*' (Duthoy, loc. cit.) patrons experienced in the frequent affirmation of their social position. To this we owe two of our principal literary sources for municipal patronage, Pliny and St. Augustine, and to them must be allowed the last word.

Pliny reveals a naïve and sentimental delight in the rituals that attended his visits to Tifernum Tiberinum, a community that had co-opted Pliny while only a youth. 'The people always celebrate my arrivals, regret my departures and rejoice in my official titles, and so to express my gratitude (one always feels disgraced at being outdone in friendly feeling) I defrayed the cost of building a temple in the town'. Almost 300 years later, Romanianus at Thagaste basked in the same ritual of adulation, his comings and goings attended by dutiful throngs, his ears accustomed only to the pleasant sibilance of superlatives. To quote from Augustine's homily: 'For, if the ever enthusiastic applause of the circus were always greeting you as you were

providing public exhibitions of bear-baiting and spectacles never previously seen there by our citizens; if you were being raised to the heavens by the united and concordant voices of fools, whose uproar is beyond all measure; if no-one would dare to be your enemy; if municipal records were to inscribe it in bronze that you were a patron not only of the citizens but also of the neighbouring peoples - then, indeed, statues would be erected, honours would be pouring in, rare privileges would be showered on you by municipalities, sumptuous tables would be laden for daily banquets, everyone would devour whatever his pleasure craved, many gifts would be showered even on those who were not seeking them, your household would be diligently cared for by your slaves and would display itself fit and ready for such great expenses meanwhile you would be living in a most pretentious mansion, in the splendour of the bathing halls, in irreprehensible games of chance, in huntings and feastings; by the voices of clients citizens and the populace you would continually be spoken of as most philanthropic, generous, refined and fortunate as indeed you have been'.

A patron's peers - *amici* and *inimici* - were one thing, his clientela another. Patronage not only entrenched the paternalistic attitudes of the municipal élite as Duthoy has observed (*loc. cit.*) but provided the patrons with a measure of security against attacks prompted by their rivals, who, aided by their faction among the populace, might attempt to represent their prosecution as deriving from the community proper. The balances provided by a community's possession of six or more patrons accommodated these rivalries in a manner beneficial to the community and tending towards social cohesion. Emulation established the momentum ensuring that obligations would become ongoing. Even men of such supreme munificence as Romanianus had adversaries whose wealth would appear to enable them to respond to the challenge. The resources of one - mentioned, but unnamed by Augustine (*Contra Academicos* II.2.6) - permitted him 'seashore resorts, beautiful parks, delightful and elegant banquets, private theatrical exhibitions'. This being said, members of certain great families tended inevitably to separate towards the top. Romanianus was certainly one of these, and one can add representatives of the *Aradii* and *Ceionii* in *Bulla Regia*, the

Accii and Octavii in Utika and the Gabinii and Pullaienii in Thugga. Their social position assured and able to withstand challenge, scions from these great clans came to accept the patronate as a family fief. To the vast mass of their clients, municipal patrons of this stature must have been imbued with an importance comparable even with that of their current idols - a Vincentius or an Eros¹²⁶.

¹²⁶ On Vincentius, the renowned pantomime ('pantomimorum decus in ore vulgi victitans perenniter') from Thamugadi cf. J. Bayet, 'Les vertus du pantomime Vincentius', *Libyca*, III (1955) pp. 103-21. His brief floruit (he died aged 23) Bayet assigns to the Severans (op. cit., p.110). The equally famous charioteer Eros, known from a late C4 mosaic from Thugga, today in the Bardo museum, is depicted with victory crown and palm, while the chants from the audience, 'Eros omnia per te', are indicated beside his head. See K. Dunbabin (op. cit., p.97 and p.188) and J. H. Humphrey (op. cit., pp.147, 222-3).

Appendix. Liberalitas and Patronage. The Case of Pliny at Comum.

Both J. Nicols and R. Duthoy take the view that Pliny was not approached by the Comum council to consider accepting co-optation¹²⁷. Nicols points to the few attested local senators as patrons in the C1, and concludes that their non-co-optation in Pliny's day was the rule and reflected the policy of the municipal senates¹²⁸. Duthoy's assessment is partly based on the small likelihood - 'pour autant que nous connaissons l'état d'esprit de Plinie' - that Pliny would reject the offer if made and partly on the epigraphic confirmation of other 'non-patrons' amongst Italy's senatorial benefactors (e.g. L. Flavius Severus of Tergeste, C5.532)¹²⁹.

On the first point, the low number of local senatorial patrons for the C1 - if a true reflection of the actual co-optation pattern - need not indicate that senators were rarely sounded as potential candidates but rather, that, when sought out, they made their excuses, and offered alternative means of benefitting their community - if not on terms as magnanimous as Pliny's, then sufficient, at least, to ensure no impairment of their dignitas. On a generous interpretation, such a hypothetical understanding reached by senators with councils will have been rooted in the notion that it was unbefitting their perceived collective dignitas to accept a return on services to their patria. Conversely, of course, the prospect of a continuous call on their services, which patronage would inevitably entail, may have been held as too onerous an exchange for a title which added little lustre to their prestige¹³⁰. In fact, drawing his conclusions on the patron list compiled by L. Harmand - a far from infallible guide - Nicols overstates the case for the non-participation of senators as patrons in C1 Italy. Duthoy's tables for status distribution in Italy (unavailable to Nicols) illustrate that while still numerically

¹²⁷ J. Nicols, 'Pliny and the Patronage of Communities', p.381, R. Duthoy, 'Sens et fonction', p.153.

¹²⁸ loc. cit..

¹²⁹ loc. cit..

¹³⁰ cf. J. Nicols, op. cit., p. 385 for the view that Pliny's informal ties with Comum also 'had to be exercised continuously'. One may doubt whether the beneficia of other 'unofficial patrons' (cf. p.380) ever approached Pliny's in frequency or in magnitude, or that the obligations were comparable to those expected of patrons proper (cf. Pliny's encouragement of his grandfather-in-law's generosity at Comum and the expectation that it would be continuous (Ep. 5.11). His grandfather-in-law was patron (see n.66 above).

relatively low in the C1, the numbers of senatorial *patroni patriae* are higher than Nicols indicates, and increase only marginally over the next two centuries in relation to their equestrian counterparts¹³¹. This situation of course reverses the trend documented in Africa, where senators of local extraction begin to dominate the patronal lists from the mid-C2 on . The difference in attitude lies surely in the far longer pedigree of Italian senators, and as a consequence, a more independent approach in their relationship with their patria (cf. for example M. Gelzer, *op. cit.*, p.138, on 'the increasing princely character' of senators in the republic). Epigraphic and literary evidence offers plentiful indication that both in frequency and in scale, private munificence in Italy attained a far higher level of outlay than in Africa, and a much greater contribution by senators¹³². The more prominent rôle of Italian senators as providers of spontaneous and costly liberalities may be viewed both as a manifestation of their freer dealings with their community, and as an explanation of their reluctance to shoulder the additional burdens of patronage.

In regard to Duthoy's predication of Pliny's behaviour, we may note that Pliny may well have declined the offer of patronage on criteria that may be deemed 'in character'. Pliny, for example, makes it plain that where ties of loyalty owed to personal friends and clientela conflicted, avoidance of offence to the former took first priority¹³³. Given the relatively low intake of senators as municipal patrons in Italy, Pliny, as a *novus homo*, may have been reluctant to break ranks with his senatorial peers. Despite the magnitude of his gifts, Pliny's munificence was according to the best senatorial traditions and Pliny's perceptions of the rôle of *optimus civis*. There was, moreover, as Nicols observes, imperial encouragement and example for such activity, and of course, the assurance of establishing a fund of gratitude and respect from the

¹³¹ 'Scénarios de cooptation des patrons municipaux en Italie', *Epigraphica*, 46 (1984) pp. 38-9. Comparison of only local senators and equestrians (coded A) from Duthoy's tables gives the following percentages:

C1	-	5/31 (= 5 + 13 + 13) = 23.81%
C2	-	25/80 (= 25 + 21 + 34) = 31.25%
C3	-	12/40 (= 12 + 11 + 17) = 30%.

¹³² cf. R. Duncan-Jones, *op. cit.*, pp.125-6 and cf. H. Jouffroy, *op. cit.*, p.463, 'c'est surtout en Italie que l'on voit intervenir de grands mécènes' (cf. pp. 107, 139-40, 153).

¹³³ Ep. I, 7, III, 4, 7-8, cf. J. Nicols, *op. cit.*, p.376.

population and his peers¹³⁴. Finally, neither the apparent low level of senatorial participation as patrons in Italy, nor the evidence for other munificent 'non-patrons' besides Pliny, nor the indications of a more active and generous rôle of Italian senators generally as benefactors, need be interpreted as signalling that communities seldom sought out senators as patrons, either from fear of giving offence (as Nicols suggests)¹³⁵, or because competition and noblesse oblige amongst senators was sufficient inducement for them to commit their services and money. The fact that some senators succumbed to approaches to become patrons indicates that the attempt was worth trying and not necessarily regarded as an affront, and it has been suggested that those who turned down the offer would be likely to come to an arrangement beneficial to the community.

¹³⁴ op. cit., p.383.

¹³⁵ op. cit., p.382.

Conclusions

The personae who make up the total of Africa's 294 municipal patrons have been seen to cover a broad spectrum. We can instance administrators who were proconsuls of Africa as well as a simple prefect of the engineers (A24). There are besides diverse persons of Africaⁿ origo - a cavalry officer's freedman (B7), an ex-centurion (B31), municipal worthies and the most august of African citizens, praetorian prefects (B115, 117), consuls, and even connections of the imperial house (C63). The principal division between patrons, nevertheless remains that envisaged by Harmand; on the one hand non-local administrators (group (A)), and on the other prominent African citizens (group (B)). Two smaller groups, however must also be recognised; African citizens who were, or had been administrators of their home province (group (C)), and persons neither administrators in Africa nor of local origin (group (D)), a group to which I have also added those patrons for whom textual lacunae prevent classification. Distinct from municipal patrons and far more infrequently attested are Africa's patrons of curiae (8) and provinces (11). The former, unique to our knowledge to Africa, are all local men, and in the majority, patrons of single curiae. None are known to have doubled as municipal patrons, whose interaction with the curiae appears minimal (cf. C155). Patrons of provinces conversely are thrice found with municipal clients in Africa (PA2, PC6, PB9). The institution is primarily known for Mauretania and appears never to have taken root in Africa Proconsularis. Local figures dominate as patrons of provinces and include persons of relatively low status (doubtless compensated for by forensic and oratorical skills).

Group (A) patrons primarily concern administrators at a provincial rather than a regional or municipal level. With one possible C4 exception (A171) procurators appear only as patrons when also of local or neighbouring origo (C93, 94). Similarly, while curatores rei publicae appear with some frequency as patrons soon after their first appearance in Africa (196), only one (or possibly two) examples concern non-Africans (A109, and ?173). The co-optation of other lesser ranking administrators of

external origo appears to have been an early and infrequent phenomenon, restricted to small communities and phased out by the early C2. Provincial governors, conversely, appear as patrons at all times, and the client-communities - where their size and status are known - can be shown to have been important urban centres. In Numidia, the legate and his successors would appear to have been routinely co-opted by the province's six major centres, and only to have been co-opted outside them when also of local origo (cf. C243b). This appears to be true, even for Lambaesis, where only two legate-patrons can be confirmed (A238a, 246). The extant epigraphy from the site seldom concerns the ordo or matters relating to it, and even fewer texts mention the legate and the community in conjunction, a virtual prerequisite for mention of patronage in the province's other major centres. In Africa Proconsularis and Mauretania, on the other hand, provincial governors were co-opted with more discretion, 'non-patrons' (i.e. recipients of non-lacunary dedications erected by the ordo) being recorded at various prominent locations (e.g. NA5, 9, 21). The proliferation and antiquity of urbanisation in Africa Proconsularis contrasts starkly with the picture provided by Numidia, where besides the Sittian implantations in the Cirtan confederation, Romanisation principally devolved upon the efforts of the legate in Lambaesis (AD81) and the four principal veteran colonies (early C2). These historical differences, and the beneficial presence of the legio III Augusta in Numidia are basic to the differing patterns of co-optation in both provinces.

Three factors chiefly distinguish group (A) patrons from their counterparts: (a) their patronage appears not to have endured beyond the term of their African office; (b) this patronage was extended to the patron's children only if they themselves also acted in an administrative capacity and (c) the benefits which flowed from their patronage also fell easily under the description of 'good government', and where mentioned at all by their clients (and all examples are late), these are carefully distinguished as *beneficia*, not *liberalitas* (a dubious exception being A259). Governors were permitted considerable latitude in their dealings with provincials, and at no time can one profitably distinguish their official and patronal activities. While it is an easy matter to enumerate public

works (e.g. AE(1968)549 (=A21), C2661 (=A251)), beneficial judgements (e.g. IRT526 (=A180), IRT575 (=A194)) and other actions advantageous to an administrator's client-community (cf. IRT330-1 (=A11), C20144 (=A226)), we can neither say with assurance whether these actions precipitated co-optation^Λ or resulted from it, and we may compare similar beneficia from governors who have been termed 'non-patrons' (cf. ch. XII, list (D)1).

The increment to a governor's prestige conferred by patronage would appear minimal, and the additional attentions he may have enjoyed whilst in office must remain conjectural. On the other hand, such patronage provided the governor with an assurance that his client would not move to prosecute him at the expiry of his term of office, and might indeed rally to his defence, either by standing against the wishes of their neighbours at the annual provincial assembly, or by presenting testimonia to the governor's conduct before the emperor.

Group (C) patrons can frequently be found to vary from group (A) patrons in the duration of their patronate, in the extension of the patronate to family members and in attestation of personal financial sacrifice on their client's behalf. While patrons of both groups (A) and (C) are found praised for their 'iustitia', 'moderatio' and 'beneficia', the terms 'amor' and 'liberalitas' would appear to be^a reserve of patriotic citizens, administrators or not. The combined assets of local origo and an African administrative post did not necessarily secure a person patronage of their patria (cf. NC7, 8 etc.), nor can it be proved that the children of those who did succeed to the title experienced any advantage over children of group (B) patrons of comparable rank.

As might be anticipated, while selectivity applied to local citizens of all status groups, those principally favoured were senators and career equestrians. The method adopted for eliciting the probable ratio of comparative eligibility has been to compare within each status-group honorands attested or not attested as patrons on dedications to them by the ordo (excluding as 'non-patrons' those honoured by lacunary texts). The results indicate an emphatic hierarchical bias, the eligibility ratio descending as

follows: male senators 91.18%, career equestrians and female senators 50%, 'sub-equestrians' (see p.247 for definition) 34.09%, remaining equestrians 18.75% and persons of decurial or unknown status 11.63%. These ratios can be presumed to be higher for children of patrons. Notwithstanding the fact that the 'hereditary clause' of *tabulae patronatus* had no binding legal force and was applied quite arbitrarily, the children of patrons clearly enjoyed advantages in eligibility, particularly those of high social status.

These statistics in conjunction with other criteria (primarily fragmentary honorific texts) offer a viable means of predicating the existence of *patroni incerti* of varying potential as candidates. Conversely, known patrons appear on a broad range of epigraphic types, on which their patronage is not recorded. Indeed a construction of non-co-optation can only be placed with any confidence when omission of patronage occurs on non-lacunary honorific dedications by the *ordo*. In chapters I and II analysis of inscription types mentioning patronage, concentrated on the haphazard spread of *tabulae patronatus*, and in Lepcis Magna, of dedications to proconsular patrons. It was argued (contra J. Nicols) that *tabulae patronatus* were probably continuously employed in Africa as elsewhere, to formalise co-optation and that their restriction to administrators in Africa was not the case in the C4 and unlikely to have been so earlier. In Lepcis Magna it was seen that the chronological distribution of texts to patrons has little bearing on Lepcitane epigraphy in general. In fact the hazards of survival have borne most heavily on C2 and C3 dedications to all patrons, not just proconsuls, and this in the very locations where such dedications were normally prominent. The figures for extant patrons from Lepcis Magna thus offer no cogent support for a decline in the co-optation of proconsuls in the high empire, unless we are to also assume that the institution of patronage itself fell into desuetude in Lepcis Magna at this time. It has been argued (contra C. Poinssot) that the relatively low status of Thugga's patrons marks an evolutionary phase of co-optation, and that those attested only as being local or Carthaginian magistrates were patrons *strictu sensu* and not *magistri pagi* under a more flattering appellation.

Thugga's patrons are well documented for the C1 - C2 (27 are known) and illustrate not only a tendency towards a hierarchical shift, purely local magistrates being eclipsed by about 138, but that thereafter increasing strains were being placed upon the integral association of *liberalitas* and *patrocinia*. This process of disassociation was dependent upon (a) existing high levels of prosperity that rendered munificence an available option to an expanding circle of the aristocracy (b) a reluctance on the *ordo*'s part to match their intake of patrons to accommodate the growth in social mobility, thus creating a parallel group of eminent and munificent 'non-patrons' and (c) the success of the most ambitious members of the aristocracy in attaining distinctions that drew them firmly within the orbit of the heart of power, thereby permitting them to render services of an altogether different order. The capacity to represent their *patria* before the emperor was of course open to all free men possessed of ambition and the gift of oratory, nor can it be denied that persons beneath senatorial status might enjoy valuable and strategic contacts. Nevertheless, the success of senators in dominating the patronate in Africa and the manifest evidence of a general reluctance on their part to contribute towards their *patria*'s embellishment or entertainment, suggests that it was in the area of acquiring privileges and immunities from the central authority that their value to the community chiefly lay.

In this area, the blurring of municipal and personal *patrocinia* may be predicated as the norm, requests for benefits for private clients being in some cases elicited as benefits for a community, and in others attached to separate requests to the community's behalf. The capacity to deliver a host of private favours enabled senators and prominent equestrians to maintain and advance the interests of the privileged class, who in turn had a vested interest in seeing persons of this calibre adorned with the honour '*qui est apud (sic) nos potissimus*' (C9.3429 = D6110). The patron profited by the formal and unequivocal recognition of his supremacy, and the title must to some degree have secured him from attack from hostile factions posing as representatives of the community. In its turn too, the community as a whole indirectly benefitted, by the prestige and renown conferred upon it by the possession of eminent senators and

equestrians in its midst and by the generation of wealth and opportunities made available by easier access to the imperial resources.

Bibliography

- ABBOTT, F.F. & JOHNSON, A.C. 'The Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire', Princeton, 1926.
- ACCAME, S. 'Il testamento di C. Cornelio Egriliano e l'arco di Caracalla in Tebessa', *Epig.*, III (1941) 237-43.
- AICHINGER, A. 'Cnaeus Domitius Calvinus, patronus von Emporiae', *Archivo Español de Arqueologica*, L - LI (1977-8) 47-55.
- ALBERTINI, E. 'Sur la plus ancienne inscription de l'Hippone romaine', *Bull. Accad. Hippo* (1936-61) 39-44.
- ALFÖLDY, G. 'Konsulat und Senatorenstand unter den Antoninen', Bonn, 1977.
- ALFÖLDY, G. 'Der Senator Q. Gargilius Macer Aufidianus und seine Verwandten', *Chiron*, VIII (1978) 362-76.
- ALFÖLDY, G. 'Bildprogramme in den römischer Städten des Conventus Tarraconensis - das Zeugnis der Statuenpostamente', *Homenaje García y Bellido IV*, *Rev. de la Univ. Complutense*, XVIII 1979 (1981) 177-275.
- AMADASI GUZZO, M.G. 'Una grande famiglia di Lepcis in rapporto con la ristrutturazione urbanistica della città (1 sec. a.C. - 1 sec. d. C)', *Coll. de l'École française de Rome*, LXVII (1983) 377-85.
- ANDREAU, J. 'Fondations privées et rapports sociaux en Italie Romaine (I^{er} - III^{es}. ap. J.C.)', *Ktèma*, II (1977), 157-209.
- ARDEVAN, R. 'Patronii coloniei Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa', *Sargetia*, XIV (1979) 185-90.
- ARNHEIM, M.T.W. 'The Senatorial Aristocracy in the Later Roman Empire', Oxford, 1972.
- AUGUET, R. 'Cruelty and Civilization : The Roman Games', London, 1972.
- BADIAN, E. Review of L. Harmand, 'Le patronat sur les collectivités publiques des origines au Bas-Empire', Paris 1957, *Latomus*, XVII (1958) 774-7.
- BALDWIN, B. 'Some Addenda to the Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire', *Historia*, XXV-VI, 118-21.
- BALDWIN, B. 'Suetonius', Amsterdam, 1983.
- BALIL, A. 'La lex gladiatoria de Italica', Madrid, 1961.
- BALIL, A. 'Sugli spettacoli di anfiteatro', *Mel. à A. Piganiol* (1966) 357-68.
- BALLU, A. 'Les ruines de Timgad', Paris, 1911.
- BALSDON, J.P.V.D. 'Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome', London, 1969.
- BARADEZ, J. 'Tipasa ville antique de Maurétanie', Alger, 1952.
- BARADEZ, J. 'Les nouvelles fouilles de Tipasa et les opérations d'Antonin le Pieux en Maurétanie', *Libya*, II (1954) 91-148.

- BARADEZ, J. 'Deux amphithéâtres inédits du 'limes' de Numidie: Gemellae et Mesarfelta,' Mél. à J. Carcopino (1966) 55-69.
- BARBIERI, G. 'L'albo senatorio da Settimo Severo a Carino', Roma, 1952.
- BARBIERI, G. 'Ostia, fistole acquarie inedite o completate', Not. d. Scavi, ser. 8a VII (1953) 151-89.
- BARNES, T.D. 'A Senator from Hadrumetum and Three Others', BHA Colloquium, VIII (1968-9) 45-58.
- BARNES, T.D. 'Tertullian. A Historical and Literary Study', Oxford, 1971.
- BARNES, T.D. 'Some Persons in the Historia Augusta', Phoenix, XXVI (1972) 140-82.
- BARNES, T.D. 'More Missing Names (AD260-395)', Phoenix, XXVII (1973) 135-55.
- BARNES, T.D. 'Another Forty Missing Persons (AD260-395)', Phoenix, XXVIII (1974) 224-33.
- BARNES, T.D. 'Proconsuls of Africa 337-92', Phoenix, XXXIX n2 (1985) 144-53, and 273-4.
- BARTOCCINI, R. 'Dolabella e Tacfarinas in una iscrizione di Leptis Magna', Epig., XX (1958) 3-13.
- BARTOCCINI, R. 'Il tempio Antoniniano di Sabratha', Libya Antiqua, VI (1964) 21-42.
- BARTON, I.M. 'Africa in the Roman Empire', Accra, 1972.
- BARTON, I.M. 'Capitoline Temples in Italy and the Provinces (especially Africa)', ANRW, II, 12, 1(1982)259-342.
- BASSIGNANO, M.S. 'Il flaminato nelle province romane dell' Africa', Roma, 1974.
- BAYET, J. 'Les statues d'Hercules des grandes thermes de Lambèse', Rec. Soc. Const., XLVIII, (1914) 1-35.
- BAYET, J. 'Les vertus du pantomime Vincentius', Libyca, III (1955) 103-21.
- BENABOU, M. 'Proconsul et légat en Afrique. Le témoignage de Tacite', Ant. Af., VI (1972) 129-36.
- BENABOU, M. 'La résistance africaine à la romanisation', Paris, 1976.
- BENABOU, M. 'Anomalies municipales en Afrique romaine?', Ktèma, VI (1981) 253-60.
- BENARIO, H.W. 'C. Paccius Africanus', Historia, VIII (1959) 496-8.
- BENARIO, H.W. 'C. Paccius Africanus at Sabratha', Epig., XXVIII (1966), 135-9.
- BENSEDDIK, N. 'Les troupes auxiliaires de l'armée romaine en Maurétanie Césarienne sous le haut-empire', Alger, 1979.
- BENZINA-BEN-ABDALLAH, Z. 'Index onomastique des inscriptions latines de Tunisie', Paris, 1983.

- BENZINA-BEN-ABDALLAH, Z. and LADJIMI-SEBÄI, L. "Egregiae memoriae filia". À propos d'une inscription inédite d'Haïdra (Tunisie)', *Ant. Af.*, XI (1977) 161-5.
- BERTHIER, A. 'Tiddis; Antique Castellum Tidditanorum', Alger, 1951.
- BERTHIER, A. 'La Numidie; Rome et le Maghreb', Paris, 1981.
- BERTRANDY, F. 'Une grande famille de la confédération Cirtéenne : Les Antistii de Thibilis', *Cah. de Tun.*, XXIV n 93-4, (1976) 7-23.
- BESCHAOUCH, A. 'La mosaïque de chasse à l'amphithéâtre découverte à Smirat en Tunisie', *CRAIBL* (1966) 134-56.
- BESCHAOUCH, A. 'Taxatio et élections municipales en Afrique romaine', *Rev. Hist. de Droit*, XLV (1967) 438-8.
- BESCHAOUCH, A. 'Mustitana I'. Recueil de nouvelles inscriptions de Mustis, cité romaine de Tunisie', *Karthago*, XIII (1967-8) 117-224.
- BESCHAOUCH, A. 'Uzappa et le proconsul d'Afrique, Sex. Cocceius Anicius Faustus Paulinus', *MEFR* LXXXI (1969) 195-218.
- BESCHAOUCH, A. 'Pluton africain', *Karthago*, XVI (1971-2) [1973] 101-5.
- BESCHAOUCH, A. 'La découverte d' 'Abbir Maius', municipes de Caracalla en Afrique Proconsulaire (Tunisie)', *BSAF* (1974) 118-23.
- BESCHAOUCH, A. 'La découverte de trois cités en Afrique Proconsulaire (Tunisie) : Alma, Ureu et Asadi. Une contribution à l'étude de la politique municipale de l'empire romaine', *CRAIBL* (1974) 219-31.
- BESCHAOUCH, A. 'Éléments celtiques dans la population du pays de Carthage', *CRAIBL* (1979) 394-409.
- BESCHAOUCH, A. 'Une sodalité africaine méconnue les Perexii', *CRAIBL* (1979) 410-20.
- BESCHAOUCH, A. 'Une inscription latine inédite d'Aïn Djemala', *BACTH*, n.s. XII-XIV B (1976-8) [1980] 232-3.
- BESCHAOUCH, A. 'Le territoire de Sicca Veneria (El-Kef) nouvelle Cirta, en Numidie Proconsulaire (Tunisie)', *CRAIBL* (1981) 105-22.
- BESCHAOUCH, A. 'Sur trois cités de l'Afrique chrétienne. Gunela, Aradi et Midicca', *CRAIBL* (1983) 683-94.
- BESCHAOUCH, A. 'Nouvelles observations sur les sodalités africaines', *CRAIBL* (1985) 453-75.
- BESCHAOUCH, A. HANOUNE, R., THÉBERT, Y. 'Les ruines de Bulla Regia', *Collection de l'École Française de Rome*, 28, 1977
- BESNIER, M. 'Les augustales de Timgad', *Rec. Soc. Const.*, XXXVI (1902) 75-89.
- BIANCHI BANDINELLI, R., CAPUTO, G., VERGARA CAFFARELLI, E., 'The Buried City. Excavations at Lepcis Magna', London, 1966.

- BIRLEY, A.R. 'Marcus Aurelius', London, 1966.
- BIRLEY, A.R. 'The Roman Governors of Britain', *Ep. Stud.*, IV (1967) 63-102.
- BIRLEY, A.R. 'Apuleius : Roman Provincial Life', *History Today*, XVIII (1968) 629-36.
- BIRLEY, A.R. 'The Coups d'État of the Year 193', *B J*, 169 (1969) 247-80.
- BIRLEY, A.R. 'Septimius Severus the African Emperor', London, 1971.
- BIRLEY, E. 'The Governors of Numidia, AD193-268', *JRS*, XL (1950) 60-8.
- BIRLEY, E. 'Rezension zu Thomasson, 'Die Statthalter der römischen Provinzen Nordafrikas,' *JRS*, LII (1962) 219-27.
- BIRLEY, E. 'Promotions and Transfers in the Roman Army II: The Centurionate', *Carnuntum Jahrbuch*, VII (1963-4) 21-33.
- BIRLEY, E. 'Africana in the Historia Augusta', *BHA Colloquium*, VIII (1968-9) 79-90.
- BIRLEY, E. 'Septimius Severus and the Roman Army', *Ep. Stud.*, VIII (1969) 63-82.
- BLANCHARD-LEMÉE, M. 'Maisons et mosaïques du quartier central de Djemila (Cuicul)', Aix-en-Provence, 1975.
- BOESWILLWALD, E., CAGNAT, R., BALLU, A. 'Timgad. Une cité africaine sous l'empire romaine', Paris, 1905.
- BOMGARDNER, D.L. 'The Revolt of the Gordians and the Amphitheatre at Thysdrus (El Djem)', *BAR*, Int. ser. 109 (1981) 211-14.
- BOMGARDNER, D.L. 'An Analytical Study of North African Amphitheatres', unpublished diss., Univ. Michigan, 1985.
- BOSSU, C. 'M.' Megonius Leo from Petelia (Regio III). A Private Benefactor from the Local Aristocracy', *ZPE*, XLV (1982) 155-65.
- BOUBE, J. 'Note sur la base de M. Sulpicius Felix', *BAM*, XII (1979-80) 124-37.
- BOUCHENAKI, M. 'Cités antiques d'Algérie', Alger, 1978.
- BOUCHIER, E. S. 'Life and Letters in Roman Africa', Oxford, 1913.
- BRAGINTON, M.V. 'Some Emergency Relief Measures during the Roman Empire', *The Classical Bulletin*, XLIV (1967) 17-21.
- BROGAN, O., REYNOLDS, J.M. 'Inscriptions from the Tripolitanian Hinterland', *Libya Antiqua*, I (1964) 43-6.
- BROUGHTON, T.R.S. 'The Magistrates of the Roman Republic', I-II, New York, 1951-2.
- BROUGHTON, T.R.S. 'Municipal Institutions in Roman Spain', *Cah. d'Histoire Mondiale*, IX (1965) 126-42.
- BROUGHTON, T.R.S. 'The Romanization of Africa Proconsularis', New York, 1968.

- BUCK, D.J., MATTINGLY, D.J. (ed.) '(Papers in Honour of Olwen Hackett), Town and Country in Roman Tripolitana', BAR, int. ser. 274, 1985.
- BURIAN, J., Recensionen - B.E. Thomasson 'Die Statthalter der römischen Provinzen Nordafrikas von Augustus, bis Diocletianus', Lund 1960', *Helikon*, III (1963) 750-3.
- BURNAND, Y. 'Les aqueducs des Gaules et des Germanies', *Mél. à P. Willeumier* (1980) 45-68.
- BURTON, G.P. 'Powers and Functions of Proconsuls in the Roman Empire, 70-260 AD' (unpublished Oxford D. Phil. diss., 1973).
- BURTON, G.P. 'Proconsuls, Assizes and the Administration of Justice under the Empire', *JRS*, LXV (1975) 92-106.
- BURTON, G.P. 'The Curator Rei Publicae : Towards a Reappraisal', *Chiron*, IX (1979) 465-87.
- CAGNAT, R. 'Fastes municipaux de Timgad', *Rec. Soc. Const.*, XXXVI (1902) 1-20.
- CAGNAT, R. 'Un temple de la Gens Augusta à Carthage', *CRAIBL* (1913) 680-6.
- CAGNAT, R. 'Le marché des Cosinius à Djemila', *CRAIBL* (1915) 316-23.
- CAGNAT, R. 'C. Iulius Crescens Didius Crescentianus fondateur de la basilique Iulia à Djemila (Algérie)', *REA*, XXII (1920) 97-103.
- CAGNAT, R., MERLIN, A. "Atlas archéologique de Tunisie", Paris, 1914-26.
- CALDERINI, A. 'Patroni di Aquileia', *Aquileia nostra*, XXXIX (1968) 13-14.
- CAMODECA, G. 'La carriera del giurista L. Neratius Priscus', *Atti Acc. Napoli*, LXXXVII 1976 (1977) 19-38.
- CAMODECA, G. 'Curatores Rei Publicae I.', *ZPE*, XXXV (1979) 225-36.
- CAPUTO, G. "Ara e podio domiziane in nella constra del teatro di Leptis Magna", *Dionisio*, XII n.s. fasc. II (1949) 83-91.
- CAPUTO, G. 'Architettura del teatro di Leptis Magna', *Dionisio*, XIII n.s. fasc. IV (1950) 164-78.
- CAPUTO, G. 'Sul ritratto di Iddibal Caphada Aemilius togato di Leptis Magna', *Studi in onore di Aristide Calderini e Roberto Paribeni*, III, Milano, (1956) 471-93.
- CARCOPINO, J. 'Les limes de Numidie et sa garde Syrienne d'après des inscriptions récemment découvertes', *Syria*, VI (1925) 118-49.
- CARCOPINO, J. 'Note complémentaire sur les numeri syriens de la Numidie romaine', *Syria*, XIV (1933) 20-55.
- CASTILLO GARCIA, C. 'Prosopographia Baetica', Pamplona, 1965.
- CHABOT, J.B. 'Les inscriptions puniques de Dougga', *CRAIBL* (1916) 119-31.
- CHAMPLIN, E. 'The Chronology of Fronto', *JRS*, LXIV (1974) 136-59.
- CHAMPLIN, E. 'Fronto and Antonine Rome', Harvard, 1980.

- CHARBONNEL, N. 'Les munera publica au III^e siècle', thèse pour le doctorat en droit (ex dactylographie), Paris.
- CHASTAGNOL, A. 'Les consulaires de Numidie', *Mél. à J. Carcopino*, 1966, 215-28.
- CHASTAGNOL, A. 'L'album municipal de Timgad', Bonn, 1978.
- CHASTAGNOL, A. 'Les femmes dans l'ordre sénatorial: titulature et rang social à Rome', *Rev. Hist.*, CCLXII (1979) 3-28.
- CHRISTOL, M. 'Les règnes de Valérien et de Gallien (253-68): travaux d'ensemble questions chronologiques', *ANRW*, II, 2 (1975) 803-27.
- CHRISTOL, M. 'Prosopographie de la province de Numidie (253-60)', *Ant. Af.*, X (1976) 69-77.
- CHRISTOL, M. 'À propos des Aradii: le stemma d'une famille sénatoriale au III^e siècle ap. J.C.', *ZPE* XXVIII (1978) 145-50.
- CHRISTOL, M. 'Gallien, Thugga et Thibursicum Bure', *Ant. Af.*, XIV (1979), 217-23.
- CHRISTOL, M. 'Hommages publics à Lepcis Magna à l'époque de Dioclétien : choix du vocabulaire et qualité du destinataire', *RHDFE*, LXI (1983) 331-43.
- CHRISTOL, M. 'À propos des inscriptions antiques du Maroc', *Latomus*, XLIV (1985).
- CHRISTOL, M. 'Essai sur l'évolution des carrières sénatoriales dans la 2^e moitié du III^e s.ap. J.C.', Paris, 1986.
- CHRISTOL, M. 'À propos des Anicii. Le III^es.', *MEFR*, XCVIII (1986) 141-64.
- CHRISTOL, M., MAGIONCALDA, A. 'Un nouveau procureur de Maurétanie Tingitane (SB5731 = I. Portes, 102)', *Ant. Af.*, XXIV (1988) 81-98.
- CHRYSOSTOM, J. 'Sur la vaine gloire et l'éducation des enfants', *Source Chrétiennes* (ed. A-M. Malingrey) Paris, 1972, 74-89.
- CLEMENTE, G. 'Il patronato nei collegia dell' impero romano', *SCO*, XXI (1972) 142-229.
- CORBIER, M. 'L'évergétisme de l'eau en Afrique. Gargilianus et l'aqueduc de Cirta', *L'Africa Romana, Atti del III convegno di studio, Sassari*, 13-15 dicembre, 1985, 113-66.
- CORBIER, P. 'Nouvelles inscriptions d'Hippone', *ZPE*, LXIII (1981) 89-95.
- COTTON, H. 'Military Tribunates and the Exercise of Patronage', *Chiron*, XI (1981) 229-38.
- COURCELLE, P. 'Une seconde campagne de fouilles à Ksar-el-Kelb', *MEFR* (1936) 166-97.
- COURTOIS, Ch. 'Grégoire VIII et l'Afrique du Nord. Remarques sur les communautés chrétiennes d'Afrique au XI siècle', *Rev. Hist.* (1945) 193-236.

- COURTOIS, Ch. 'Timgad. Antique Thamugadi', Alger 1951.
- CRINITI, M. 'La nuova prosopografia dell' età tardo-imperiale romana', *Nuova Rivista Storica*, LVIII (1974) 133-52.
- CURCHIN, L.A. 'Personal Wealth in Roman Spain', *Historia*, XXXII (1983) 227-44.
- DANKER, F.W. 'Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field', St. Louis, 1982.
- DARDAINE, S. 'La formule épigraphique 'impensam remisit' et l'évergétisme en Bétique', *Mél. de la Casa de Velasquez*, XVI (1980) 39-55.
- D'ARMS, J.H. 'Control, Companionship and Clientela. Some Social Functions of the Roman Communal Meal,' *Echos du Monde Classique, Classical Views*, XXVIII (1984) 327-48.
- DAVIES, R.W. 'M. Aurelius Atho Marcellus', *JRS*, LVII (1967) 20-2.
- DEBBASCH, Y. 'Colonia Iulia Karthago'. La vie et les institutions municipales de la Carthage romaine', *Rev. Hist. de Droit*, XXXI (1953) 30-53, 212.
- DEBERGH, J. 'Note sur les inscriptions de Bulla Regia, AE (1962) no. 183-4', *Latomus*, XXXII (1973) 152-7.
- DE BLOIS, L. 'The Policy of the Emperor Gallienus', Leiden, 1976.
- DEGRASSI, A. rec. a : J.M. Reynolds - J.B. Ward-Perkins, 'The Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitana', Rome, 1952; *Quaderni di Arch. della Libia*, III (1954) 113-6.
- DEGRASSI, N. 'L'ordinamento di Leptis Magna, nel primo secolo dell' impero e la sua costituzione a municipio romano', *Epig.*, VII (1945) 3-21.
- DEININGER, J. 'Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit von Augustus bis zum Ende des dritten Jahrhunderts n. Chr.', München, 1965.
- DEMAN, A. 'Glanes à propos de dix années de prosopographie impériale de l'ordre équestre', *Latomus*, XXXII (1973) 135-51.
- DEMOUGIN, S. 'Les juges des cinq décuries originaires de l'Italie', *Anc. Soc.*, VI (1975) 143-202.
- DEMOUGIN, S. 'Splendidus eques Romanus', *Epig.*, XXXVI (1975) 174-87.
- DE ROCH, S. 'Tébessa, antique Theveste', Alger 1952.
- DÉ ROCHE, L. 'La carrière de L. Iulius Victor Modianus et les bureaux de la préfecture du prétoire sous Septime - Sévère', *REA*, LI (1949) 60-8.
- DÉROCHE, L. 'Les fouilles de Ksar Toual Zammel et la question de Zama', *MEFR* (1948) 55-104.
- DESANGES, J. 'Le statut des municipes d'après les données africaines', *Rev. Hist. de Droit*, L (1972) 353-73.

- DESANGES, J. 'Un curateur de la sauterelle sur la pertica de Carthage en 48-9 de notre ère', *BACTH*, n.s. X-XI B (1974-5) [1978], 135-41.
- DEVIJVER, H.J. 'De Aegypto et exercitu romano sive prosopographia militiarum equestrium quae ab Augusto ad Gallienum seu statione seu origine ad Aegyptum pertinebant', *Studia Hellenistica*, XXII (1975) 5-128.
- DEVIJVER, H.J. 'Prosopographia militiarum equestrium quae fuerunt ab Augusto ad Gallienum', Leuven, 1976.
- DEVIJVER, H.J. 'L'armée romaine en Maurétanie Césarienne', *Latomus*, XLIII (1984) 584-95.
- DEVIJVER, H.J. 'Ein neuer Band der Prosopographia Militiarum Equestrium', *ZPE*, LIX (1985) 205-223.
- DEVIJVER, H.J., VAN WONTERGHEM, F. 'Documenti epigrafici riguardanti l'acquedotto e il teatro di Alba Fucens : Gli interventi di due magistrati - benefattori nel I secolo d. C.', *ZPE*, LVIII (1985) 163-81.
- DI VITA, A. Gli 'emporia' di Tripolitania dall'età di Massinissa a Diocleziano : un profilo storico - istituzionale', *ANRW*, X, 2 (1982) 515-95.
- DI VITA-EVRARD, G. 'La dédicace du temple d'Isis à Sabratha : une nouvelle inscription africaine à l'actif de C. Paccius Africanus', *Libya Antiqua*, III-IV (1966-7) 13-20.
- DI VITA-EVRARD, G. 'Le proconsul d'Afrique polyonyme IRT517:une nouvelle tentative à l'identification', *MEFR*, XCI (1981) 183-226.
- DI VITA-EVRARD, G. 'Note sur quelques timbres d'amphores de Tripolitaine', *BACTH*, n.s. XIX fasc B (1983) 147-59.
- DI VITA-EVRARD, G. 'L. Volusius Bassus Cerealis e la creazione della provincia di Tripolitania', *L'Africa Romana*, Atti del II convegno di studio Sassari, 14-16 dicembre 1984 (1985) 149-77.
- DI VITA-EVRARD, G. 'En feuillant les 'Inscriptions antique du Maroc 2', *ZPE*, LXVIII (1987) 193-225.
- DOBO, A. 'Inscriptiones extra fines Pannoniae Daciaeque repertae ad res earundem provinciarum pertinentes', editio IV, 1976, Budapest.
- DOBSON, B. 'The Primipilares of the Roman Army', doctoral thesis, Durham, 1955.
- DOBSON, B. 'The praefectus fabrum in the early Principate', *Britain and Rome* (1966) 61-84.
- DOBSON, B. 'Die Primipilares', Köln, 1978.
- DOMASZEWSKI, A. von 'Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres', Köln, 1967.

- DONDIN-PAYRE, M. 'Recherches sur un aspect de la romanisation de l'Afrique du Nord. L'expansion de la citoyenneté romaine jusqu'à Hadrien.', *Ant. Af.*, XVII (1981) 93-132.
- DRINKWATER, J.F. 'Gallic Personal Wealth', *Chiron*, IX (1979) 237-42.
- DUNBABIN, K. 'The Mosaics of Roman North Africa; Studies in Iconography and Patronage', Oxford, 1978.
- DUNCAN-JONES, R. 'Costs, Outlays and Summae Honorariae from Roman Africa', *PBSR*, XXX (1962) 47-115.
- DUNCAN-JONES, R. 'City Population in Roman Africa', *JRS*, LIII (1963) 85-90.
- DUNCAN-JONES, R. 'Wealth and Munificence in Roman Africa', *PBSR*, XXXI (1963) 159-77.
- DUNCAN-JONES, R. 'The Purpose and Organisation of the Alimenta', *PBSR*, XXXII (1964) 123-46.
- DUNCAN-JONES, R. 'Human Numbers in Towns and Town-organizations of the Roman Empire; the Evidence of Gifts', *Historia*, XIII (1964) 199-208.
- DUNCAN-JONES, R. 'The Finances of the Younger Pliny', *PBSR*, XXXII (1964) 177-88.
- DUNCAN-JONES, R. 'An Epigraphic Survey of Costs in Roman Italy', *PBSR*, XXXIII (1965) 189-306.
- DUNCAN-JONES, R. 'Equestrian Rank in the Cities of the African Provinces under the Principate : an Epigraphic Survey', *PBSR*, XXXV (1967) 147-88.
- DUNCAN-JONES, R. 'The Chronology of the Priesthood of Africa Proconsularis under the Principate', *Ep. Stud.*, V (1968) 151-8.
- DUNCAN-JONES, R. Review of A.R. Hands, 'Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome', London, 1968, *JRS*, LIX (1969) 287-9.
- DUNCAN-JONES, R. 'Patronage and City Privileges - The Case of Giufi', *Ep. Stud.*, IX (1972) 12-16.
- DUNCAN-JONES, R. 'A Statue Base and its History', *Latomus*, XXXIII (1974) 118-23.
- DUNCAN-JONES, R. 'The Procurator as Civic Benefactor', *JRS*, LXIV (1974) 79-85.
- DUNCAN-JONES, R. 'The Wealth of Gaul', *Chiron*, XI (1981) 217-20.
- DUNCAN-JONES, R. 'The Economy of the Roman Empire: Quantitative Studies', Cambridge, 1982.
- DUPUIS, X. 'À propos de trois inscriptions africaines', *ZPE*, LXXII (1988) 103-8.
- DURRY, M. Review of A. Beschtaouch, 'Mustitana', *Bulletin Critique* 549-51.
- DUTHOY, R. 'Note sur l'inscription ILAfr. 356 = AE (1917-8) n17', *Latomus*, XXV (1966) 567-9.

- DUTHOY, R. 'Curatores rei publicae en Occident durant le principat. Recherches préliminaires sur l'apport des sources épigraphiques', *Anc. Soc.*, X (1979) 171-238.
- DUTHOY, R. 'Quelques observations concernant la mention d'un patronat municipal dans les inscriptions', *L'Ant. Class.*, L (1981) 295-305.
- DUTHOY, R. 'Le profil social des patrons municipaux en Italie sous le Haut-Empire', *Anc. Soc.*, XIV (1983) 121-54.
- DUTHOY, R. 'Scénarios de cooptation des patrons municipaux en Italie', *Epig.*, XLVI (1984) 23-48.
- DUTHOY, R. 'Sens et fonction du patronat municipal durant le Principat', *l'Ant. Class.*, LIII (1984) 145-56.
- DUVAL, N. 'L'urbanisme de Sufetula = Sbeitla en Tunisie', *ANRW*, X, 2 (1982) 596-632.
- DUVAL, N. 'Topographie et urbanisme d'Ammaedara (actuellement Haïdra, Tunisie)', *op. cit.*, 633-71.
- DUVAL, N. 'L'iconographie des villas africaines et la vie rurale dans l'Afrique romaine de l'antiquité tardive (résumé)', 110^e congrès nat. des soc. savantes, Montpellier (1985), III^e colloque sur l'hist. et l'arch. d'Afrique du Nord, 163-76.
- DUVAL, P.M. 'Cherchel et Tipasa. Recherches sur deux villes fortes de l'Afrique romaine', Paris, 1946.
- ECK, W. 'Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian. Prospographische Untersuchungen mit Einschluss der Jahres - und Provinzialfasten der Statthalter', München, 1970.
- ECK, W. 'M. Pompeius Silvanus, consul designatus tertium-ein Vertrauter Vespasians und Domitians', *ZPE*, IX (1972) 259-75.
- ECK, W. 'Wahl von Stadtpatronen mit Kaiserlicher Beteiligung?', *Chiron*, IX (1979) 489-94.
- ECK, W. 'Ein Supplement zu CIL XI', *Actes du VII^e congrès int. d'Épig. grecque et latine*, 1979, 363-5.
- ECK, W. 'Die Präsenz senatorischer Familien in den Städten des Imperium Romanum bis zum späten 3 Jahrhundert', *Studien zur Antiken Sozialgeschichte* (1980) Wien, 283-322.
- ECK, W. 'Miscellanea prosopographica', *Z PE*, XLII (1981) 227-56.
- ELMAYER, A.F. 'The Re-interpretation of Latino-Punic Inscriptions from Roman Tripolitania', *Society for Libyan Studies*, XIV (1983) 86-95 and XV (1984) 93-107.

- ELMAYER, A.F. 'The centenaria of Roman Tripolitania', *Society for Libyan Studies*, XVI (1985) 77-85.
- ENGESSER, F. 'Der Stadtpatronat in Italien und den Westprovinzen des römischen Reiches bis Diocletian', Freiburg, 1955.
- ENNABLI, A. 'North African Newsletter 3, Part I, Tunisia 1956-80', *AJA*, LXXXVII (1983) 197-206.
- ENNAIFER, M. 'La cité d'Althiburos et l'édifice des Asclepieia', Tunis, 1976.
- d'ESCURAC-DOISY, H. 'Quelques inscriptions de Caesarea (Cherchel)', *MEFR*, LXIV (1952) 87-110.
- d'ESCURAC-DOISY, H. 'Inscriptions latines de Timgad', *MEFR*, LXV (1953) 99-137.
- d'ESCURAC-DOISY 'Notes sur le phénomène associatif dans le monde paysan à l'époque du Haut-Empire', *Ant. Af.*, I (1967) 59-71.
- EUZENNAT, M.M. 'Le premier établissement romain de Tizirt', *MEFR*, LXIX (1957) 75-80.
- EUZENNAT, M.M. 'Fragments inédits de bronzes épigraphiques marocaines', *Ant. Af.*, III (1969) 115-32.
- EUZENNAT, M.M. 'Jérôme Carcopino et le Maroc', *Hommages à J. Carcopino*, Paris, 1977, 81-9.
- EUZENNAT, M.M. 'Les troubles de Maurétanie', *CRAIBL* (1984) 372-94.
- FANT, J.C. "The *Curatores rei publicae* in Italy from their Inception to the Death of Commodus", (microfilm), dis. abs. Univ. of Michigan, Ann. Arbor, 1976.
- FENELLI, M. 'Uno sconosciuto personaggio dell' ordine senatorio', *Epig.*, XXXIII (1971) 168-9.
- FENTRESS, E. 'Dii Mauri and Dii Patrii', *Latomus*, XXXVII (1978) 507-16.
- FENTRESS, E. 'Numidia and the Roman Army, Social, Military and Economic Aspects of the Frontier Zone', *BAR*, int. ser., LIII (1979) Oxford.
- FENTRESS, E. 'African Building : Money, Politics and Crisis in Auzia', *The Roman West in the Third Century*, *BAR*, int. ser., CIX (1982) Oxford, 199-210.
- FERCHIOU, N. 'Un affranchi impérial julio-claudien aux environs de Bou Arada', *Échanges* I, 3 (1979) 357-62.
- FERCHIOU, N. 'Un décor architectonique du II^e siècle en Afrique proconsulaire (Tunisie). Les vestiges du Capitole de Numlulis. À la mémoire du Professeur J. B. Ward Perkins', *PBSR*, LII n.s. XXXIX (1984) 115-23.
- FERCHIOU, N. 'Quelques inédits de Furnos Maius (Afrique proconsulaire): nouvelles données sur l'évolution juridique de cette ville' *L'Africa Romana*, *Atti del III convegno di studio*, Sassari, 14-16 dicembre 1984 (1985) 179-88.
- FERGUSON, J.F. 'Aere Conlato', *The Classical Journal*, XIII (1917-8) 515-20.

- FÉVRIER, J.G. 'La grande inscription dédicatoire de Mactar', *Semitica*, VI (1956) 15-31.
- FÉVRIER, P.A. 'Remarques sur les inscriptions funéraires datées de Maurétanie Césarienne orientale (II - V siècle)', *MEFR*, LXXVI (1964) 105-72.
- FÉVRIER, P.A. 'Notes sur le développement urbain en Afrique du Nord. Les exemples comparés de Djemila et de Sétif', *Cah. Arch.*, XIV (1964) 1-47.
- FÉVRIER, P.A. 'Inscriptions inédites relatives aux domaines de la région de Sétif', *Mél. à A. Piganiol* (1966) 217-225R.
- FÉVRIER, P.A. 'Djemila', *Alger*, 1968.
- FÉVRIER, P.A. 'Urbanisation et urbanisme de l'Afrique romaine', *ANRW*, X,2(1982) 321-96.
- FINK, R.O. 'M. Aurelius Atho Marcellus', *A.J. Phil.*, LXXVIII (1967) 84-5.
- FISHWICK, D. 'The Institution of the Provincial Cult in Africa Proconsularis', *Hermes*, XCII (1964) 342-62.
- FISHWICK, D. 'The Annexation of Mauretania', *Historia*, XX (1971) 467-87.
- FISHWICK, D. 'The Institution of the Provincial Cult in Roman Mauretania', *Historia*, XXI (1972) 704-11.
- FISHWICK, D. 'Le culte impérial sous Juba II et Ptolémée de Maurétanie : le témoignage des monnaies', *BACTH*, n.s. 19B (1985) 225-34.
- FISHWICK, D. 'The Imperial Cult in the Latin West. Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire' *Leiden*, 1987.
- FISHWICK, D and SHAW, B.D. 'The Era of the Cereres', *Historia*, XXVII (1978) 343-54.
- FITZ, J. 'Alcuni Cursus Honorum nelle Provincie Danubiane', *Epig.*, XXVI (1974) 101-9.
- FLACH, D. 'Inchriftenuntersuchungen zum römischen Kolonat in Nordafrika', *Chiron*, VIII (1978) 441-92.
- FLORIANI-SQUARCIAPINO, M. 'Circhi e spettacoli circensi nelle province romane d'Africa', *RAL*, XXXIV (1979) 275-90.
- FORNI, G. 'Il reclutamento delle legioni da Augusto a Diocleziano', *Milano - Roma*, 1953.
- FOUCHER, L. 'La maison de la procession dionysiaque à El Djem', *Paris*, 1963.
- FOUCHER, L. 'Hadrumetum', *Paris*, 1964.
- FOUCHER, L. 'À propos des cirques africains', *BACTH* n.s. V (1969) 207-13.
- FRADIER, G. 'Les mosaïques romaines de Tunisie', *Tunis*, 1986.
- FREIS, H. 'Zwei Lateinische Inschriften aus Albanien', *ZPE*, LXI (1985) 224-7.
- FREZOULS, E. 'Les Baquates et la province romaine de Tingitane', *BAM*, II (1957) 65-116.

- FREZOULS, E. 'Les Ocratii de Volubilis, d'après deux inscriptions inédites', Mél. à A. Piganiol (1966) 233-47.
- FREZOULS, E. 'Évergétisme et construction urbaine dans les Trois Gaules et les Germanies', *Revue du Nord*, LXVI (1984) 29-54.
- FUSHÖLLER, D. 'Tunisien und Ostalgerien in der Römerzeit. Z. hist. Geogr. d'örtl. Atlasafrika vom Fall Karthagos bis auf Hadrians Limesbau', Bonn, 1979.
- GABLER, D. 'Munera Pannonica', *Arch. Ertesitö*, XCIII (1966) 20-35.
- GABRICEVIC, B. 'Issa et son patron Q. Numerius Rufus', *Adriatica praehistorica et antiqua. Miscellanea Gregorio Novak dicata digress Miroslavljevic V., Miocevic D & Suic M.; Rendic. Fac. Philos. Zagradiensis Inst. Archeol. & Amsterdam Hakkerit*, XXXIV (1970) 553-62.
- GAGÉ, J. 'Les organisations des 'iuvenes' en Italie et en Afrique du début du III^e siècle au bellum Aquileiense (238 ap JC)', *Historia*, XIX (1970) 232-58.
- GALAND, L. 'Mons, Mopht et Mopti', *MEFR*, LXI (1950) 35-91.
- GALLIVAN, P. 'The Fasti for AD70-96', *CQ*, XXXI (1) (1981) 186-220.
- GARNSEY, P.D.A. 'Trajan's alimenta. Some problems', *Historia*, XVII (1968) 367-81.
- GARNSEY, P.D.A. 'Honorarium decurionatus', *Historia*, XX (1971) 309-25.
- GARNSEY, P.D.A. 'Taxatio and Pollicitatio in Roman Africa', *JRS*, LXI (1971) 116-29.
- GARNSEY, P.D.A. 'Economy and Society of Mediolanum under the Principate', *PBSR*, XLIV (1976) 13-27.
- GARNSEY, P.D.A. 'Rome's African Empire under the Principate', 'Imperialism in the Ancient World', ed. Garnsey, P.D.A., Whittaker, C.R., Cambridge (1978) 223-54.
- GASCOU, J. 'Le décret municipal de Tergeste en l'honneur de Lucius Fabius Severus', *Annuaire École prat. des htes. - études*, IV^e section, sc. hist. & philol. (1966-7), 511-20.
- GASCOU, J. 'Inscriptions de Tébessa', *MEFR*, LXXXI (1969) 537-600.
- GASCOU, J. 'La politique municipale de l'empire romain en Afrique proconsulaire de Trajan à Septime-Sévère', Roma, 1972.
- GASCOU, J. 'Les curies africaines : origine punique ou italienne?', *Ant. Af.*, X (1976) 33-48.
- GASCOU, J. 'P. Iulius Liberalis, sacerdotalis provinciae Africae et la date du statut colonial de Thysdrus', *Ant. Af.*, XIV (1979) 189-96.
- GASCOU, J. 'Une énigme épigraphique : Sévère Alexandre et la titulature de Giuffi', *Ant. Af.*, XVIII (1981) 231-40.

- GASCOU, J. 'Les magistratures de la Confédération Cirtéenne', *BACTH*, XVII B (1981) 323-35.
- GASCOU, J. 'La politique municipale de Rome en Afrique du Nord I & II', *ANRW*, X,2 (1982) 136-320.
- GASCOU, J. 'Pagus et castellum dans la Confédération Cirtéenne', *Ant. Af.*, XIX (1983) 175-207.
- GASCOU, J. 'Une inscription faussement attribuée à Thuburbo Minus', *MEFR*, XCVII (1985) 459-76.
- GASCOU, J. 'Les sacerdotés Cererum de Carthage', *Ant. Af.*, XXIII (1987) 95-128.
- GASCOU, J. 'Y avait-il un pagus Carthaginois à Thuburbo Maius?', *Ant. Af.*, XXIV (1988) 67-80.
- GASCOU, J., GROS P., LORiot X. 'Une grande famille de Cuicul à travers le second siècle', *Annuaire 1964-5, École prat. htes. - études*, 69-79.
- GASPERINI, L. 'Nuova dedica onoraria di 'Forum Clodii'', *Misc. greca e roma*, VI (1978) 439-58.
- GASTINEL, G., 'Carthage et l'Énéide', *Rev. Arch.*, XXIII (1926) 40-102.
- GAUTHIER, P. 'Les cités grecques et leur bienfaiteurs (IV -I^{er} siècle avant J. C.). Contribution à l'histoire des institutions', *École française d'Athènes. Bull. de correspondance hellénique*, supp. XII, 1985.
- GELZER, M. 'The Roman Nobility', Oxford, 1969.
- GOLFETTO, A. 'Dougga : die Geschichte einer Stadt im Schatten Karthagos', Basel, 1961.
- GOODCHILD, R.G. 'Two Monumental Inscriptions of Lepcis Magna', *PBSR*, XVIII (1950) 72-82.
- GOUDINEAU, C. 'Note sur Antistia Pia Quintilla, flaminique et patronne', *Gallia*, XXXVII (1979) 271-3.
- GRANT, M. 'Gladiators', London, 1967.
- GRIMAL, P. (trans. & ed. Woloch, G.M.) 'Roman Cities', Wisconsin, 1983.
- GROS, P. 'Une dédicace carthaginoise sur le forum de Bolsena' *MEFR*, XCII (1980) 977-92.
- GROS, P., DENEAUVE, J. 'Hypothèses sur le centre monumental de Carthage romaine d'après les recherches récentes sur la colline de Byrsa', *CRAIBL*, 1980, 299-332.
- GRUENDEL, R. (ed.) 'Addenda bibliographica praecipue ad CIL e periodico l'Année épigraphique nominato excerpta', Berlin, 1965.
- GSELL, S. 'Les monuments antique de l'Algérie', Paris, 1901.
- GSELL, S. 'Atlas archéologique de l'Algérie', Paris, 1911.
- GSELL, S. 'Cherchell; Antique Iol - Caesarea', Alger, 1952.

- GSELL, S., CARCOPINO, J. 'Le base de M. Sulpicius Felix et le décret des décurions de Sala', *MEFR*, XLVIII (1931) 1-39.
- GSELL, S, JOLY, C.A. 'Khamissa, Mdaourouch, Announa I', Alger-Paris, 1914.
- GUEY, J. 'Au théâtre de Leptis Magna Le proconsulat de Lollianus Avitus et la date de l'Apologie d'Apulée', *REL*, XXIX (1951) 307-17.
- GUEY, J. PERNETTE, A. 'Lépide à Thabraca', *Karthago*, IX (1958) 81-8.
- GUNDEL, H.G., 'Devotus Numini Maiestatique Eius', *Epig.*, XV (1953) 128-50.
- HALFF, G. 'L'onomastique punique de Carthage', *Karthago*, XII (1963-4) 63-146.
- HALFMANN, H. 'Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2Jh. n. Chr.', Göttingen, 1979.
- HANDS, A.R. 'Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome, London, 1968.
- HARMAND, L. 'Le patronat sur les collectivités publiques des origines au bas-empire - Un aspect social et politique du monde romaine', Paris, 1957.
- HARMAND, L. 'Observations sur l'inscription de Sala', *Mél. à A. Piganiol*, 1966, 1211-20.
- HAYWOOD, R. 'Roman Africa', *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, IV (1959) ed. T. Frank, New Jersey, 1-119.
- HEINZ, W. 'Römische Thermen', München, 1983.
- HEURGON, J. 'Fronton de Cirta', *Rec. Soc. Const.*, LXXX (1957-9) 139-53.
- HOLTHEIDE, B. 'Matrona Stolata - Femina Stolata', *ZPE*, XXXVIII (1980) 127-34.
- HORSTKOTTE, H. 'Die Datierung des Dekurionenverzeichnisses von Timgad und die spätrömische Klerikergesetzgebung; *Historia* XXXIII, (1984) 238-47.
- HOUSMAN, A.E. 'An African Inscription', *Classical Review* (1927) 60-1.
- HUMPHREY, J.H. 'Roman Circuses. Arenas for Chariot Racing', London, 1986.
- HUMPHREY, J.H., PEDLEY, J. GRIFFITHS 'Roman Carthage', *Scientific American*, Jan. 1978, 110-20.
- IFIE, J.E. 'The Romano-African Municipal Aristocracy and the Imperial Government under the Principate', *Mus. Afr.* II (1973) 36-58.
- ILLUMINATI, A. 'Appunti di epigrafia africana', *RAL*, XXVII (1972) [1973] 467-81.
- ILLUMINATI, A. 'Appunti di epigrafia africana II Hr. Sidi Khalifa : iscrizione in onore del procurator Q. Agrio Rusticiano,' *RAL*, XXVIII (1973) 913-20.
- ILLUMINATI, A. 'Alcune considerazioni intorno all' excusatio honoris flamonii in base ad un testo epigrafico africano', *RAL*, XXXII (1977) 263-71.
- JACQUES, F. 'Ampliatio et mora : évergètes récalcitrants d'Afrique romaine', *Ant. Af.*, IX (1975) 159-80.
- JACQUES, F. 'Un documente sur le proconsulat d'Afrique de C. Brutius Praesens, beau-père de Commode?', *ZPE*, XXII (1976) 215-22.

- JACQUES, F. 'Osservazioni sulla carriera di alcuni curatores rei publicae', *Annali dell' istituto universitario orientale di Napoli*, I (1979) 193-8.
- JACQUES, F. 'La questure municipale dans l'Afrique du Nord romaine', *BACTH*, n.s. XVII B (1981) [1984] 211-23.
- JACQUES, F. 'Voluntariat et compétition dans les carrières municipales durant le Haut-Empire', *Ktèma*, VI (1981) 262-70.
- JACQUES, F.. 'Les curateurs des cités africaines au III^e siècle', *ANRW*, X,2 (1982) 62-135.
- JACQUES, F. 'Le privilège de liberté. Politique impériale et autonomie municipale dans les cités de l'Occident romain (161-224)', Roma, 1984.
- JACQUES, F. 'Genitalis curia. L'hérédité du décurionat revendiquée dans une inscription de Numidie', *ZPE*, LIX (1985) 146-50.
- JACQUES, F. 'Trois notes de prosopographie sénatoriale', *ZPE*, LXVII (1987) 189-99.
- JACZYNOWSKA, M. 'Les organisations de juvenes et l'aristocratie municipale au temps de l'empire romain', *Recherches sur les structures sociales dans l'antiquité classique*, (Caen 25-6, Avril 1969), Paris, 1970, 265-74.
- JANON, M. 'Recherches à Lambèse', *Ant. Af.*, VII (1973) 193-254.
- JARRETT, M.G. 'A Study of the Municipal Aristocracies of the Roman Empire with Special Reference to North Africa', Durham, 1958 (microfilm).
- JARRETT, M.G. 'The Career of L. Titinius Clodianus', *Latomus*, XXI (1962) 853-9.
- JARRETT, M.G. 'The African Contribution to the Imperial Civil Service', *Historia*, XII (1963) 209-26.
- JARRETT, M.G. 'Decurions and Priests', *A.J. Phil.*, XCII (1971) 513-38.
- JARRETT, M.G. 'An Album of the Equestrians from North Africa in the Emperor's Service', *Ep. Stud.*, IX (1972) 146-232.
- JOHNSTON, D. 'Munificence and Municipia : Bequests to Towns in Classical Roman Law', *JRS*, LII (1985) 105-25.
- JONES, A.H.M., MARTINDALE, J.R., MORRIS, J. 'The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire' I, & II, Cambridge, 1971 and 1980.
- JONES, B.W. 'The 'Ignotus' of AE (1955) 23', *La Parola del Passato*, XXXVI (1981) 382-4.
- JOUFFROY, H. 'La construction publique en Italie et dans l'Afrique romaine', Strasbourg, 1986.
- KAJANTO, I. 'Supernomina. A Study in Latin Epigraphy', Helsinki-Helsingfors, 1966.

- KEHOE, D. 'Lease Regulations for Imperial Estates in North Africa' ZPE, LVI (1984) 193-219 and part II, ZPE, LIX (1985) 151-72.
- KENNEDY, D.L. 'Ti Claudius Subatianus Aquila, 'First Prefect of Mesopotamia', ZPE, XXXVI (1979) 255-62.
- KENNEDY, D.L. 'C. Velius Rufus', Britannia, XIV (1983) 183-96.
- KHATIB, N. 'L'archéologie marocaine et les inscriptions nouvelles du Maroc 1961-4', BAM, V (1964) 361-82.
- KIRSTEN, E. 'Nordafrikanische Stadtbilder', Heidelberg, 1961.
- KISCH, Y de 'Tarifs de donations en Gaule romaine d'après les inscriptions', Ktèma, IV (1979) 259-80.
- KNAPP, R.C. 'The Origins of Provincial Prosopography in the West', Anc. Soc., IX (1978) 187-222.
- KOLBE, H.G. 'Die Statthalter Numidiens von Gallien bis Konstantin (268-320)', München-Berlin, 1962.
- KOLENDO, J. 'Les cirques dans l'Afrique romaine', Archeologia, XXV (1974) 26-52.
- KOLENDO, J. 'Un Romain d'Afrique élevé dans le pays des Costoboces. À propos de CIL, VIII, 14667', Actes du VII^e congrès int. d'Épig. grecque et latine, 1979, 396-7.
- KOLENDO, J. 'Deux inscriptions d'Utique vues par A. Daux', ZPE, XLII (1981) 261-2.
- KOLENDO, J. 'Les domaines des Caelii en Afrique au I^e siècle avant notre ère', BACTH, n.s. XIXB(1985) 53-62.
- KOLENDO, J. 'Les grandes domaines en Tripolitane d'après l'itinéraire Antonin', 110^e congrès nat. des soc. savantes, Montpellier (1985) III^e colloque sur l'hist. et l'arch. d'Afrique du Nord, 149-62^{di}.
- KOLENDO, J. 'L'iscrizione di un auriga^{di} Theveste (ILAlgI3146)', L'Africa Romana Atti del II convegno di studio, Sassari, 4-16 dicembre 1984(1985), 195-200.
- KOTULA, T. 'Les assemblées provinciales dans l'Afrique romaine sous le bas empire', Wrocław, 1965.
- KOTULA, T. 'À propos d'une inscription reconstituée de Bulla Regia (Hammam-Darradji). Quelques municipes 'mystérieux' de l'Afrique proconsulaire', MEFR, LXXIX (1967) 207-20.
- KOTULA, T. 'Les principes gentis et les principes civitatis en Afrique romaine', EOS, LV 1965 [1968] 347-65.
- KOTULA, T. 'Les curies municipales en Afrique romaine', Wrocław 1968.
- KOTULA, T. 'Einige Bemerkungen zu der Tribus Papiria in den afrikanischen Inschriften', Klio, L1 (1969) 277-85.

- KOTULA, T. 'Nouvelles observations sur les 'portes' de Thugga et sur les curies municipales en Afrique romaine', *Klio*, LIV (1972) 227-37.
- KOTULA, T. 'Les viri principales dans les textes épigraphiques de Lepcis Magna', *Acta Arch. Slov.*, XXVIII (1977) 436-45.
- KOTULA, T. 'Principales almae Karthaginis', *Ant. Af.*, IV (1979) 237-45.
- KOTULA, T. 'Épigraphie et histoire : les flamines perpétuels dans les inscriptions latines nord-africaines du Bas-Empire romain', *EOS*, LXVII (1979) 131-6.
- KOTULA, T. 'Les curies africaines; origines et composition. Retractatio', *EOS*, LXVIII (1980) 133-46.
- KOTULA, T. 'Les principales d'Afrique. Étude sur l'élite municipale nord-africaine au Bas-Empire romain', Wrocław 1982.
- KRAUSE, J.-U. 'Das Spätantike Städtepatronat', *Chiron*, XVII (1987) 1-80.
- LACHAUX, J.-C. 'Théâtres et amphithéâtres d'Afrique proconsulaire', Aix-en-Provence, 1979.
- LADAGE, D. 'Städtische Priester und Kultämter im Lateinischen Westen des Imperium Romanum zur Kaiserzeit', Köln, 1971.
- LADAGE, D. 'Collegia Iuvenum - Ausbildung einer municipalen Elite?', *Chiron*, IX (1979) 319-46.
- LANCEL, S. 'Populus Thabarbusitanus et les gymnasia de Quintus Flavius Lappianus', *Libyca*, VI (1958) 143-51.
- LANCEL, S. 'Tipasitana V : inscriptions inédites de Tipasa. Le dossier del' amphithéâtre et la nécropole occidentale', *Ant. Af.*, XVI (1980) 135-59.
- LANCEL, S. 'Tipasa de Maurétanie; histoire et archéologie I. État des questions des origines préromaines à la fin du III^e siècle', *ANRW*, X, 2 (1982) 739-86.
- LANGHAMMER, W. 'Die Rechtliche und Soziale Stellung der Magistratus Municipales und der Dekuriones in der Übergangs phase der Städte von sich Selbstverwaltenden Gemeinden zu Vollzugsorganen des Spätantiken Zwangsstaate C2-4 Jh. der Römischen Kaiserzeit', Wiesbaden, 1973.
- LAPORTE, J.-P. 'Cap Djinet : Une Dédicace des Cissiani à Sévère Alexandre', *BACTH*, n.s. IX (1973)B, 25-37.
- LA REGINA, A. 'Cluvienses Carricini', *Arch. Class.*, XXV-VI (1973-4) 331-40.
- LASSERE, J.-M. 'Recherches sur la chronologie des épitaphes paiennes de l'Africa', *Ant. Af.*, VII (1973) 7-151.
- LASSERE, J.-M. 'Ubique populus', Paris, 1977.
- LASSERE, J.-M. 'Remarques sur le peuplement de la colonia Iulia Augusta Numidica Simitthus', *Ant. Af.*, XVI (1980) 27-44.
- LASSERE, J.-M. 'L'organisation des contacts de population dans l'Afrique romaine sous la république et au Haut-Empire', *ANRW*, X,2 (1982) 397-426.

- LASSERE, J.-M. 'La colonia Septimia Aurelia Auziensium', *Ktèma*, VI (1981) 317-31.
- LASSUS, J. 'Recherches et publications épigraphiques en Algérie 1952-5', *Atti del terzo congresso int. di epig. greca e latina*, 1959, Roma, 213-28.
- LASSUS, J. 'La salle à sept absides de Djemila - Cuicul', *Ant. Af.*, V (1971) 193-207.
- LE BOHEC, Y. 'Les centurions des chevaliers romains', *REA*, LXXVII (1975) 108-24.
- LE BOHEC, Y. 'Notes prosopographiques sur la legio III Augusta', *ZPE*, XXXI (1978) 188-92.
- LE BOHEC, Y. 'Les marques sur briques et les surnoms de la III^{ème} légion Auguste', *Epig.*, XLIII (1981) 127-60.
- LE GALL, J. 'Inscription criobolique découverte à Utique', *Karthago*, IX (1958) 121-7.
- LE GLAY, M. 'Djemila; nouvelle inscription sur les Cosinii', *Libyca*, III (1955) 169-71.
- LE GLAY, M. 'Épigraphie et organisation des provinces africaines', *Atti del terzo congresso int. di epig. greca e latina*, Roma, 1959, 229-44.
- LE GLAY, M. 'La vie intellectuelle d'une cité africaine des confins de l'Aurès', *Latomus*, XLIV (1960) 485-91.
- LE GLAY, M. 'Taxatio et autonomie municipale d'après une nouvelle inscription de Cuicul en Algérie', *Akte des IV int. Kongresses für griechische und lateinische Epigraphik*, Wien, 1962 (1964) 224-33.
- LE GLAY, M. 'Saturne africain : histoire', Paris, 1966.
- LE GLAY, M. 'Saturne africain : monuments', vol. I - II, Paris, 1961, 1966.
- LE GLAY, M. 'Une dédicace à Vénus offerte à 'Caesarea' (Cherchel) par le futur empereur Galba', *Mél. à J. Carcopino*, 1966, 629-39.
- LE GLAY, M. 'Les Flaviens et l'Afrique', *MEFR*, LXXX (1968) 201-46.
- LE GLAY, M. 'À la recherche d'Icosium', *Ant. Af.*, II (1968) 7-52.
- LE GLAY, M. 'La vie religieuse à Lambèse d'après des nouveaux documents', *Ant. Af.*, V (1971) 125-53.
- LE GLAY, M. 'Recherches et découvertes épigraphiques dans l'Afrique romaine depuis 1962', *Chiron*, IV (1974) 629-46.
- LE GLAY, M. 'Les curiales de la Curia Commodiana de Timgad', *Epig.*, XLII, 1-2 (1980) 93-118.
- LE GLAY, M. 'Les premiers temps de Carthage romaine : pour une révision des dates', *BACTH*, n.s. XIXB (1985) 235-48.

- LE GLAY, M., TOURRENC, S. 'Nouvelles inscriptions de Timgad sur des légats de la troisième légion Auguste', *Ant. Af.*, XXI (1985) 103-36.
- LENNOX-MANTON, E. 'Roman North Africa', London, 1988.
- LEPELLEY, C. 'Les cités de l'Afrique romaine au Bas-Empire. Étude d'histoire municipale', *L'information historique*, XL (1978) 124-8.
- LEPELLEY, C. 'Les cités de l'Afrique romaine au Bas-Empire', I 'La permanence d'une civilisation municipale' Paris, 1979. II 'Notices d'histoire municipale', Paris, 1981.
- LEPELLEY, C. 'La carrière municipale dans l'Afrique romaine sous l'empire tardif', *Ktèma*, VI (1981) 333-47.
- LEPELLEY, C. 'Notes sur sept inscriptions africains du Bas-Empire', *ZPE*, XLIII (1981) 185-93.
- LEPELLEY, C. 'L'apport des lettres de Saint Augustin nouvellement découvertes à la connaissance de l'Afrique romaine : essai de bilan', *BACTH*, n.s. XIX B (1985) 273-85.
- LEQUÉMENT, R. 'Fouilles à l'amphithéâtre de Tébessa (1965-8)', *Bull. arch. Alg.*, II (1966-7) 107-22.
- LESCHI, L. 'Tipasa de Maurétanie', Alger, 1950.
- LESCHI, L. 'Travaux en publications épigraphiques en Algérie', *Actes du deuxième Congrès int. d'épigraphie grecque et latine*, Paris, 1952, 112-31.
- LESCHI, L. 'Études d'épigraphie, d'archéologie et d'histoire africaines', Paris, 1957.
- LEVEAU, Ph. 'L'aile II des Thraces, la tribu des Mazices et les praefecti gentis en Afrique du Nord (À propos d'une inscription nouvelle d'Oppidum Novum et de la pénétration romaine dans la partie orientale des plaines du Chélif)', *Ant. Af.*, VII (1973) 153-92.
- LEVEAU, Ph. 'Caesarea de Maurétanie', *ANRW*, X,2 (1982) 683-738.
- LEVEAU, Ph. 'Quelques inscriptions inédites des régions chélifiennes (Maurétanie césarienne)', *Ep. Stud.*, III (1983) 207-21.
- LEVEAU, Ph. 'Caesarea de Maurétanie, une ville romaine et ses campagnes', Roma, 1984.
- LEVEAU, Ph. 'Nouvelles inscriptions de Cherchell III', *Bull. Arch. Alg.*, VII 1977-9 (1986) 111-91.
- LEVI DELLA VIDA, G. 'Le iscrizioni neopuniche della Tripolitania', *Rivista della Tripolitania (= Libya)*, III (1927) 91-116.
- LEVI DELLA VIDA, G. 'Due iscrizioni imperiali neopuniche di Leptis Magna', *Afr. Ital.*, VI (1935) 1-29.

- LEVI DELLA VIDA, G. 'Iscrizioni neopuniche di Tripolitania', *RAL*, IV (1949) 399-412.
- LEVI DELLA VIDA, G. 'The Neo-Punic Dedication of the Ammonium at Ras el Haddagia', *PBSR*, XIX (1951) 65-8.
- LEVI DELLA VIDA, G. 'Iscrizione punica di Lepcis', *RAL*, X (1955) 550-61.
- LEVI DELLA VIDA, G. 'Frustuli neo punici tripolitani' *RAL*, XVIII (1963) 463-82.
- LEVI DELLA VIDA, G. 'Su una bilingue latino - neo punica da Leptis Magna', *Atti acc. delle scienze di Torino*, C1 (1967) 396-409.
- LEVI DELLA VIDA, G. 'Magistrature romane e indigene nelle iscrizioni puniche tripolitane', *Studi in onore di Edouardo Volterra*, VI (1971) 457-69.
- LIBANIUS 'Discours sur les patronages', [ed., transl. & commentary by L. Harmand] Clermont, 1955.
- LORINCZ, B. 'C. Iulius Commodus Orfitianus', *AUB*, II (1974) 2, 59-73.
- LUCAS, C. 'Notes on the *curatores rei publicae* of Roman Africa', *JRS*, XXX (1940) 56-74.
- LUSSANA, A. 'Osservazioni sulle testimonianze di munificenza privata della Gallia Cisalpina nelle iscrizioni latine,' *Epig.*, XII (1950) 116-23.
- LUSSANA, A. 'Munificenza privata nell'Africa Romana', *Epig.*, IV (1952) 100-13.
- LUSSANA, A. 'Contributo agli studi sulla munificenza privata in alcune regioni dell'Impero', *Epig.*, XVIII (1956) 77-93.
- McDERMOTT, W.C. 'Stemmata quid faciunt?' *The Descendants of Frontinus*, *Anc. Soc.*, VII (1976) 229-61.
- MacKENDRICK 'The North African Stones Speak', London, 1980.
- MACKIE, N.K. 'Augustan Colonies in Mauretania', *Historia*, XXXII (1983) 332-58.
- MacMULLEN, R. 'Soldier and Civilian', London, 1963.
- MacMULLEN, R. 'Roman Imperial Building in the Provinces', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, LXIV (1959) 207-35.
- MacMULLEN, R. 'Roman Government's Response to Crisis, AD235-337', Yale, 1976.
- MAHBOUBI, M. 'Les élites municipales de la Numidie : deux groupes : étrangers à la cité et vétérans', *ANRW*, X,2 (1982) 673-81.
- MAHJOUBI, A. 'Recherches d'histoire et d'archéologie à Henchir el-Faouar : la cité des Belalitani Maiores', Tunis, 1978.
- MAHJOUBI, A. 'La cité de Belalis Maior (Henchir el-Faouar) de l'époque punique-numide à l'époque romaine', *L'Africa Romana*, *Atti del II convegno di studio Sassari*, 15-16 dicembre 1984, (1985) 201-11.
- MANN, J.C. 'An Inscription from Carthage', *ZPE*, LXXII (1988) 109-10.

- MARCILLET-JAUBERT, J. 'Remarques sur quelques inscriptions de Lambèse', *Ant. Af.*, I (1967) 73-82.
- MARCILLET-JAUBERT, J. 'Les inscriptions d'Altava', Aix-en-Provence, 1968.
- MARCILLET-JAUBERT, J. 'Prosopographia Imperii Romani saec I-II-III Pars IV fasc. 3,' *Gnomon*, XLII (1970) 1972.
- MARCILLET-JAUBERT, J 'Le légat de Numidie A. Iulius Pompilus Piso T. Vibius Laevillus [-]atus Berenicianus', *Acta Arch.*, XXVIII (1977) 346-59.
- MARCILLET-JAUBERT, J 'Le gouverneur de Numidie, Flavius Aelius Victorinus', *BACTH*, XVII B (1984) 359-61.
- MARCILLET-JAUBERT, J. 'Sur une inscription de Lambèse', *ZPE*, LIV (1984) 165-8.
- MARCILLET-JAUBERT, J. 'Sur des flamines perpétuels de Numidie', *ZPE*, LXIX (1987), 207-23.
- MARCINIAK, E. 'Munificentia Privata' and the Erection of Italian Amphitheatres during the First Two Centuries A.D. on the Grounds of Epigraphic Sources', *EOS*, LXIV (1976) 269-80.
- MARCY, G. 'Les inscriptions libyques bilingues de l'Afrique du Nord', Paris, 1936.
- MAREC, E. 'Hippone La Royale. Antique Hippo Regius', Alger, 1950.
- MAREC, E. 'Le forum d'Hippone', *Libyca*, II (1954) 363-414.
- MAREC, E. 'Inscriptions recueillies à Hippone dans les thermes du nord et du sud', *Libyca*, IV (1956) 291-317.
- MARTINDALE, J.R. 'Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire. Addenda et Corrigenda to Volume I', *Historia*, XXIII (1974) 246-52 and XXIX (1980) 474-97.
- MASTINO, A. 'La ricerca epigrafica in Tunisia (1973-85), L'Africa Romana Atti del I convegno di studio, Sassari, 16-17, dicembre 1983 (1984) 113-66.
- MATHISEN, R.W. 'PLRE II; suggested addenda et corrigenda', *Historia*, XXXI (1982) 364-86.
- MATTHEWS, E. 'The Social Background of the Apologia and Florida of Apuleius', B. Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1968.
- MATTHEWS, J. 'Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court AD364-425', Oxford, 1975.
- MATTHEWS, K.D. Jr., COOK A.W. 'Cities in the Sand, Leptis Magna and Sabratha in Roman Africa', Pennsylvania, 1957.
- MATTINGLY, D.J. 'Two Inscriptions from Gheriat el Garbia', *Soc. for Libyan Studies*, XVI (1985) 67-75.
- MAURIN, L., PEYRAS, J. 'Uzalitana. La région de l'Ansarine dans l'antiquité', *Cah. de Tun.*, XIX (1971) 11-103.

- MAURIN, L. PEYRAS, J. 'Ureu Municipium Uruensium. Recherches archéologiques et épigraphiques dans une cité romaine inédite d'Afrique proconsulaire', Paris, 1974.
- MAZARD, J., BABELON, J. 'Corpus Nummorum Numidiae Mauretaniaeque', Arts et métiers graphiques, Paris, 1955.
- M'CHAREK, A. 'Aspects de l'évolution' démographique et sociale à Mactaris au II^e et III^e siècles ap. J.C.', Tunis, 1982.
- MERLIN, A. 'Fouilles à Thuburbo Maius en 1916', CRAIBL (1917) 66-77.
- MERLIN, A.. 'C. Vettius Sabinianus proconsul d'Afrique', CRAIBL (1919) 355-72.
- MERLIN, A., POINSSOT, L. 'Les inscriptions d'Uchi Maius', Paris, 1908.
- MILLAR, F. 'The Roman Empire and its Neighbours', New York, 1966.
- MILLAR, F. 'The Emperor in the Roman World', London, 1977.
- MORIZOT, P. 'Le Génie Auguste de Tfilzi', BACTH, X-XI (1974-5) 45-91.
- MROZEK, S. 'Quelques remarques sur les inscriptions relatives aux distributions privées de l'argent et de la nourriture dans les municipes italiens aux I, II et III^e siècles d.n.è.', Epig., XXX (1968) 156-71.
- MROZEK, S. 'De variis in Italicis municipiis munificentiae privatae generibus', Meander, XXV (1970) 15-31.
- MROZEK, S. 'Primus omnium sur les inscriptions des municipes italiens', Epig., XXIII (1971) 60-9.
- MROZEK, S. 'Crustulum et mulsum dans les villes italiennes', Athenaeum, I (1972) 294-300.
- MROZEK, S. 'Munificentia Privata in den Städten Italiens der spätrömischen Zeit', Historia, XXVII (1978) 355-68.
- MROZEK, S. 'Quelques remarques sur aere collato et pecunia collata', Epig., XLIII (1981) 161-3.
- MROZEK, S. 'Munificentia Privata in Bauwesen und Lebensmittelverteilung in Italien während des Prinzipates', ZPE, LVII (1984) 233-40.
- NEESEN, L. 'Die Entwicklung der Leistungen und Ämter (munera et honores) im römischen Kaiserreich des Zweiten bis Vierten Jahrhunderts', Historia, XXX (1981) 203-35.
- NESSERHAUF, H. 'Zur Militärgeschichte der Provinz Mauretania Tingitana', Epig., XII (1950) 34-48.
- NICOLS, J. 'The Emperor and the Selection of the patronus civitatis. Two Examples', Chiron, VIII (1978) 429-32.
- NICOLS, J. 'Tabulae patronatus. A Study of the Agreement between Patron and Client-Community', ANRW, II, 13 (1980) 535-56.

- NICOLS, J. 'Zur Verleihung öffentlicher Ehrungen in der römischen Welt', *Chiron*, IX (1979) 242-60.
- NICOLS, J. 'Pliny and the Patronage of Communities', *Hermes*, CVIII (1980) 365-85.
- NICOLS, J. 'Prefects, Patronage and the Administration of Justice', *ZPE*, LXXII (1988) 201-17.
- NOVAK, D.M. 'Cirta and the Anicii of Uzappa, A Note', *Klio*, LVIII (1976) 21-3.
- NOVAK, D.M. 'The Early History of the Anician Family', *Coll. Lat. n.164*, Bruxelles (1979) 119-65.
- OLIVOVA, V. 'Sports and Games in the Ancient World', London, 1984.
- ORS, A. d' 'Sobre la 'Tabula patronatus' de Badelona', *Emerita*, VII (1939) 156-68.
- ORS, A. d' 'Una nueva tabla emeritense de hospitium publicum', *Emerita*, XVI (1948) 46-74.
- ORS, A. d' 'Licinio Silvano, patrono de Badalona', *Emerita*, XLII (1974) 69-75.
- ORS, A. d', CONTRERAS, R. 'Miscelanea epigráfica', *Emerita*, XLV, (1977) 7-17.
- PALMA, A. 'Le curae pubbliche. Studi sulle strutture amministrative romane', Napoli Iovene, XII (1980).
- PASQUALINI, A. 'Note su alcuni aspetti 'politici' di un costume di epoca imperiale : le sportulae municipali', *Helikon*, IX-X (1969-70) 265-312.
- PAVESE, M.P. 'L. Caninius Valens, procurator IIII publicorum Africae', *Epig.*, XLV (1983) 227-31.
- PAVIS D'ESCURAC, H. 'Pour une étude sociale de l'Apologie d'Apulée', *Ant. Af.*, VIII, (1974) 89-101.
- PAVIS D'ESCURAC, H. 'Flaminat et société dans la colonie de Timgad', *Ant. Af.*, XV (1980) 183-200.
- PEKARY, T. 'Inchriften von Avenches', *Pro Aventico*, XIX (1967) 37-56.
- PELLETIER, A. 'Les sénateurs d'Afrique proconsulaire d'Auguste à Gallien', *Latomus*, XXIII (1964) 511-31.'
- PETITMENGIN, P. 'Inscriptions de la région de Milev', *MEFR*, LXXIX, 1 (1967) 165-205.
- PEYRAS, J. 'Deux études de toponymie et de topographie de l'Afrique antique', *Ant. Af.*, XXII (1986) 213-53.
- PFEIFFER, H.P. 'The Roman Library at Timgad', *MAAR*, IX (1931) 157-66.
- PFLAUM, H.G. 'Le marbre de Thorigny', Paris, 1948.
- PFLAUM, H.G. 'Additions et corrections au livre de G. Barbieri 'L'albo senatorio da Settimio Severo à Carino (193-285)', 1952, *Rev. de Phil.*, XXX (1956) 68-82.
- PFLAUM, H.G. 'Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain', Paris, 1960.

- PFLAUM, H.G. 'Les gendres de Marc-Aurèle', *Journal des Savants* (1961) 28-41.
- PFLAUM, H.G. 'Index onomastique des 'Inscriptions Latines d'Afrique', *Karthago*, XI (1961-2) 169-208.
- PFLAUM, H.G. 'Deux familles sénatoriales des II^e et III^e siècles', *Journal des Savants* (1962) 108-22.
- PFLAUM, H.G. 'Les titulatures abrégées 'Imp. Antoninus Aug.' et 'Antoninus Imp.' s'appliquent en principe à Antonin le Pieux', *Mél. à J. Carcopino*, 1966, 717-36.
- PFLAUM, H.G. 'Titulature et rang social sous le Haut-Empire', *Recherches sur les structures sociales dans l'antiquité classique* (Caen 25-6 Avril, 1969) Paris, 1970, 159-85.
- PFLAUM, H.G. 'Remarques sur l'onomastique de Castellum Tidditanorum', *BACTH*, X-XI (1974-5) 9-43.
- PFLAUM, H.G. 'Les fastes de la province de Narbonnaise', *Gallia*, XXX, Paris, 1978.
- PFLAUM, H.G. 'L'Afrique Romaine. Scripta Varia', Vol. I Paris, 1978.
- PFLAUM, H.G. 'Le Gaul et l'Empire Romain. Scripta Varia', Vol. II, Paris, 1981.
- PFLAUM, H.G. 'Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain, supplément', Paris, 1982.
- PICARD, G. C. 'Castellum Dimmidi', *Alger*, 1948.
- PICARD, G. C. 'Les religions de l'Afrique antique', Paris, 1954.
- PICARD, G. C. 'Civitas Mactaritana', *Karthago*, VIII (1957) 1-156.
- PICARD, G. C. 'Postumus et Vetranius', *Atti del terzo congresso int. di epig. greca e latina*, Roma, 1959, 263-70.
- PICARD, G. C. 'La civilisation de l'Afrique romain', Paris, 1959.
- PICARD, G. C. 'Le septizonium de Cincari (Hr. Tounga) et le problème des septizonia', *Monuments et mémoires de la fondation Eugène Piot*, LII, 2(1960) 77-93.
- PICARD, G. C. 'Mosaïques africaines du III^e siècle ap. J.C.' *Rev. Arch*, II (1960) 17-49.
- PICARD, G. C. 'Rubellius Plautus, patron de Maktar', *Cah. de Tun.*, XI (1963) n 44, 69-74.
- PICARD, G. C. 'L'administration territoriale de Carthage', *Mél. à A. Piganiol*, 1966, 1257-65.
- PICARD, G. C. 'Le démographie de Maktar', *Acta of the Fifth International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy*, Cambridge, 1967 (1971) 269-75.

- PICARD, G. C. 'Un témoignage sur le commerce des objets d'art dans l'empire romain. La statue de bronze d'Apollon⁶⁶ de Maktar offerte par S. Iulius Possessor', *R.A.* (1968) 2,297-314.
- PICARD, G.C. 'Les fouilles de Maktar (Tunisie) 1970-73', *CRAIBL* (1974) 9-33.
- PICARD, G. C. 'La villa du taureau à Silin (Tripolitaine)', *CRAIBL*, (1985) 227-41.
- PICARD, G. C. 'Essai d'interprétation du sanctuaire de Hoter Miskar à Maktar', *BACTH*, n.s. XVIII B (1988) 17-20.
- PICARD, G. C. 'Le temple de Hoter Miskar à Maktar', *op. cit.*, 21-5.
- PISO, I, ROGCZEA, P. 'Ein Apolloheiligtum in der Nähe von Tibiscum', *ZPE*, LVIII (1985) 212.
- PLEKET, H.W. 'Epigraphy and Benefactors', *Hermeneus*, LV (1983) 137-251.
- POINSSOT, C. 'Les ruines de Dougga', Tunis, 1958.
- POINSSOT, C. 'Suo et Sucubi', *Karthago*, X (1959-60) 91-129.
- POINSSOT, C. 'Immunitas perticae Carthaginiensium', *CRAIBL* (1962) 55-76.
- POINSSOT, C. 'Aqua Commodiana civitatis Aureliae Thuggae', *Mél. à J. Carcopino*, 1966, 771-85.
- POINSSOT, C. 'Sufes maior et princeps civitatis Thuggae', *Mél. à A. Piganiol*, 1966, 1267-70.
- POINSSOT, C. 'M. Licinius Rufus, patronus pagi et civitatis Thuggensis', *BACTH*, n.s. V (1969) 215-58.
- POINSSOT, L. 'Note sur un inscription de Koudiet es Souda', *CRAIBL* (1913) 424-8.
- POINSSOT, L. 'Trois inscriptions de Thuburbo Maius', *CRAIBL* (1915) 325-33.
- POINSSOT, L. 'Datus, conductor praediorum regionis Thuggensis', *CRAIBL* (1920) 357-9.
- POINSSOT, L. 'Pheradi Maius', *CRAIBL* (1927) 62-5.
- POINSSOT, L. 'Plusieurs inscriptions de Thuburbo Maius', *Rev. Tun.*, XLIII-IV (1940) 195-230.
- POINSSOT, L, QUONIAM, P. 'Bêtes d'amphithéâtre sur trois mosaïques du Bardo', *Karthago*, II-III (1951-2) 129-65.
- POTTER, T.W., 'Models of Urban Growth : The Cherchel Excavations 1977-81', *BACTH*, n.s. XIX B (1985) 457-68.
- QUONIAM, P. 'À propos d'une inscription de Thuburnica (Tunisie). Marius et la romanisation de l'Afrique', *CRAIBL* (1950) 332-6.
- QUONIAM, P. 'Deux notables de Bulla Regia', *Karthago*, XI (1961-2) 3-8.

- RAMIREZ, J.L. 'Las donaciones Ob Honorem y de Sportulae en las provincias romanas de las Galias según la documentación epigráfica', *Actes du VII^e Congrès int. d'épig. grecque et latine* (1979) 451-4.
- RATTI, E. 'I Praefecti Iure Dicundo e la Praefectura come distinzione gromatica', *Centro studii e documentazione sull' Italia Romane*, VI (1974-5) 251-64.
- RAVEN, S. 'Rome in Africa', London, 1984.
- REBUFFAT, R. 'Enceintes urbaines et insécurité en Maurétanie Tingitane', *MEFR*, LXXXVI (1974) 501-22.
- REBUFFAT, R. 'Ara Cerei', *MEFR*, XCIV (1982) 911-19.
- REBUFFAT, R. 'L'arrivée des romains en Tripolitaine intérieure', *BACTH*, n.s. IXB (1985) 249-56.
- RÉMY, B. 'La carrière de Q. Aradius Rufinus Optatus Aelianus', *Historia*, XXV (1976) 458-77.
- RÉMY, B. 'La carrière de Sex. Tadius Lusius Nepos Paullinus', *ZPE*, XLIII (1981) 307-15.
- REY-COQUAIS, J.P. "Le mécénat obligatoire sous l'empire romain : réflexions sur les structures et les comportements civiques dans l'antiquité", *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, CXXI (1979) 49-57.
- REYNOLDS, J. 'IRT: A Supplement', *PBSR*, XXIII (1955) 124-47.
- ROCKWELL, J.C. 'Private Baustiftungen für die Stadtgemeinde auf Inschriften der Kaiserzeit in Westen des römischen Reiches', Berlin, 1909.
- ROMANELLI, P. 'Storia delle province romane dell' Africa', Roma, 1959.
- ROMANELLI, P. 'Le iscrizioni Volubilitane dei Baquati e i rapporti di Roma con le tribù indigene dell' Africa', *Hommages à Albert Grenier III* (1962) 1347-66.
- ROMANELLI, P. 'Della popolazione di Cartagine Leptis Minus colonia', *RAL*, XXVI (1971) 11-17.
- ROMANELLI, P. 'La politica municipale romana nell' Africa Proconsolare', *Athenaeum*, LIII (1975) 144-71.
- ROMANELLI, P. 'Le due tavole in bronzo di patronato di comunità africane conservate nel Museo dell' Accademia', *Annuario dell' Accademia etrusca di Cortona*, XVIII (1979) 479-87.
- ROSTOVITZ, M. "The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire", Oxford, 1926.
- ROULAND, N. 'Pouvoir politique et dépendance personnelle dans l'Antiquité Romaine. Génèse et rôle des rapports de clientèle', Bruxelles, 1979.
- ROUSSIER, J. 'La pollicitatio pecuniae', II, Napoli (1952) 51-8.
- RUOFF-VÄÄNÄNEN, E. 'Praetors of the Country Towns', *Arctos*, XI (1977) 103-15.

- SABBATINI TUMOLESI LONGO, P. 'Gladiatoria, II', *RAL*, XXVII (1972) 485-95.
- de STE CROIX, G.E.M. 'Suffragium : from Vote to Patronage', *B. J. Soc.*, V (1954) 33-48.
- SALAMA, P. 'Les voies romaines de l'Afrique du Nord', Alger, 1951.
- SALAMA, P. 'Nouveaux témoignages de l'oeuvre des Sévères dans la Mauretanie césarienne (deuxieme partie)', *Libyca*, III (1955) 329-63.
- SALAMA, P. 'La colonie de Rusguniae d'après les inscriptions', *Revue Africaine*, CIX (1955) 5-52.
- SALLER, R.P. 'Promotion and Patronage in the Equestrian Careers', *JRS*, LXX (1980) 44-63.
- SALLER, R.P. 'Personal Patronage under the Early Empire', Cambridge, 1982.
- SALOMONSON, J.W. 'The Fancy Dress Banquet' : an Attempt at Interpreting a Roman Mosaic from El Djem', *Bulletin van de Vereeniging tot Bevordering der Kennis van de Antieke Beschaving*, XXXV (1960) 25-55.
- SANIE, S. 'Les Africains en Dacie romaine', *Actes du VII^e Congrès int. d'épig. grecque et latine* (1979) 465-6.
- SARGENTI, M. 'Problemi di vita municipale nella normativa imperiale da Traiano^a ai Severi', *Atti del convegno celebrativo del centenario della Rivista Archeologica della Antica Provincia e Diocesi di Como 1872-1972*: Soc. Arch. Comense, Como Tip. Ed. Nosedà (1974) 401-14.
- SARTORI, F. 'Note di epigrafia e prosopografia bellunesi' *Archivio stor. di Belluno Feltre e Cadore* (Belluno Tip. Piave), XLVI nos. 215-6 (1976) 41-64.
- SAULNIER, C. 'Laurens Lavinus'. Quelques remarques à propos d'un sacerdote équestre à Rome', *Latomus*, XLIII (1984) 518-33.
- SCHUMACHER, L. 'Das Ehrendekret für M. Nonius Balbus aus Herculaneum', *Chiron*, VI (1976) 165-84.
- SERRAO, F. 'Il giurista Salvio Giuliano nell' iscrizione di Thuburbo Maius', *Atti del terzo congresso int. di Epig. greca e latina*, Roma, 1959, 395-413.
- SESTON, W. 'Des 'portes' de Thugga à la Constitution' de Carthage, *Rev. Hist.*, 237 (1967) 277-94.
- SHATZMAN, I. 'Senatorial Wealth and Politics', Bruxelles, 1976.
- SHAW, B.D. 'Rural Markets in North Africa and the Political Economy of the Roman Empire', *Ant. Af.*, XVII (1981) 37-83.
- SHERK, R.K. 'The Municipal Decrees of the Roman West', *Arethusa Monogr.*, II, New York, 1970.
- SHERWIN-WHITE, A.N. 'Geographical Factors in Roman Algeria', *JRS*, XXXIV (1944) 1-10.

- SLIM, H. 'Recherches preliminaires sur les amphithéâtres de l'Afrique Proconsulaire', *L'Africa romana*, Atti del I convegno di studio Sassari 16-17 dicembre, 1983 (1984) 129-65.
- SLIM, H. 'Nouveaux témoignages sur la vie économique à Thysdrus', *BACTHS*, n.s. XIX B (1985) 63-85.
- SMAJDA, E. 'L'inscription du culte impérial dans la cité: l'exemple de Lepcis Magna au début de l'empire', *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne*, IV (1978) 171-86.
- SNYDER, W.F. 'An Inscription at Tébessa in Algeria', *Yale Classical Studies*, VII (1940) 297-317.
- SOFFREDI, A. 'Il Patronato in Italia alla luce delle iscrizioni latine', *Epig.*, XVIII (1956) 157-72.
- SOLIN, H. 'CIL X Supplementum', *Actes du VII^e Congrès int. d' épig. grecque et latine* (1979) 472-3.
- SPEIDEL, M. 'Legionary Cohorts in Mauretania. The Rôle of Legionary Cohorts in the Structure of Expeditionary Armies', *ANRW*, X,2, (1982) 850-60.
- SPEIDEL, M. 'Roman Army Studies', Amsterdam, 1984.
- SUSINI, G. 'Q. Pompeius Senecio, console nel 169 d.c.', *Mél. à A. Piganiol*, 1966, 289-99.
- SYME, R. 'The Roman Revolution', Oxford, 1952.
- SYME, R. 'Governors of Pannonia Inferior', *Historia*, XIV (1965) 349.
- SYME, R. 'Les proconsuls d'Afrique sous Hadrien', *REA*, XLVII (1965) 342-52.
- SYME, R. 'Legates of Cilicia under Trajan', *Historia*, XVIII (1969) 352-66.
- SYME, R. 'Roman Papers', I-III, Oxford, 1979.
- SYME, R. 'Hadrianic Proconsuls of Africa', *ZPE*, XXXVII (1980), 1-18.
- SYME, R. 'The Age at Marriage of Roman Senators', *Historia*, XXXVI (1987) 318-32.
- SZILAGYI, J. 'Zur Entwicklung der Baukosten in den westlichen Provinzen in der römischen Kaiserzeit', *A. Arch. Slov.*, XIX (1968) 111-17.
- THÉBERT, Y. 'La romanisation d'une cité indigène d'Afrique : Bulla Regia', *MEFR*, LXXXV (1973) 247-312.
- THOMASSON, B.E. 'Die Statthalter der römischen Provinzen Nordafrikas von Augustus bis Diocletianus', Lund, 1960.
- THOMASSON, B.E. 'Praesides provinciarum Africae proconsularis Numidiae Mauretaniarum qui fuerint ab Augusti aetatis usque ad Diocletianum', *Opuscula Romana*, VII (1969) 163-211.
- THOMASSON, B.E. 'Laterculi praesidum', Lund, 1972.
- THOMASSON, B.E. 'Mauretania, Numidia', *RE*, Supp. XIII (1973) col. 307-22.

- THOMASSON, B.E. 'Senatores procuratoresque romani nonnulli quorum cursus honorum munerumve post volumina prosopographiae imperii romani', Göteborg, 1975.
- THOMASSON, B.E. 'Zur Verwaltungsgeschichte der römischen Provinzen Nordafrikas (Proconsularis, Numidia, Mauretaniae)', ANRW, X,2, (1982), 3-61.
- THOMPSON, L.A. 'Settler and Native in the Urban Centres of Roman Africa', Africa in Classical Antiquity, Ibadan, 1969, 132-8.
- THOMPSON, L.A. 'Roman and Native in the Tripolitanian Cities in the Early Empire', ANRW, X,2, (1982) 235-49.
- THOUVENOT, R. 'Table de patronat découverte à Banasa (Maroc)', CRAIBL (1940) 131-7.
- THOUVENOT, R. 'Deuxième table de patronat découverte à Banasa (Maroc)', CRAIBL (1947) 485-9.
- THOUVENOT, R. 'Le culte de Saturne en Maurétanie Tingitane', REA, LVI (1954) 150-3.
- TISSOT, C. 'Géographie comparée de la province romaine d'Afrique', Paris I 1884, II 1888.
- TORELLI, M. 'Per una storia della classe dirigente di Leptis Magna', RAL, XXVIII (1974) 377-410.
- TOURRENC, S. 'La dédicace du temple du Génie de la colonie à Timgad', Ant. Af., II (1968) 197-220.
- TOWNEND, G.B. 'The Post of ab epistulis in the Second Century', Historia, X (1961) 375-81.
- TUDOR, D. 'Les constructions publiques de la Dacie romaine d'après les inscriptions', Latomus, XXIII (1964) 271-301.
- TURLAN, J. 'L'obligation ex voto', Rev. Hist. de Droit, XXXIII (1955) 504-36.
- VAN NOSTRAND, J.J. Jr. 'The Imperial Domains of Africa Proconsularis', Univ. of California Publications in History, XIV, 1925
- VEYNE, P. 'Deux inscriptions de Vindonissa', Karthago, IX (1958) 91-117.
- VEYNE, P. 'Le Marsyas 'colonial' et l'indépendance des cités', Rev. de Phil., XXXV (1961) 87-98.
- VEYNE, P. 'Pain et cirque', Paris, 1976.
- VIDMAN, L. 'Zum Stemma der Nonii Asprenates', Listy Filol., CV (1982) 1-5.
- VILLE, G. 'La gladiature en Occident des origines à la mort de Domitien', Roma, 1981.
- VITUCCI, G. 'Nuova iscrizione da Leptis Magna', Atti del terzo Congresso int. di Epig. greca e latina, 1959, 271-5.

- VOGEL-WEIDEMANN, V. 'Die Statthalter von Afrika und Asia in der Jahren 14-68 n. Chr.; eine Untersuchung zum Verhältnis Princeps und Senat', Bonn, 1982.
- VOLTERRA, E. 'L'adozione testamentaria ed un 'iscrizione latina e neopunica della Tripolitania,' RAL, VII (1952) 175-88.
- WARD-PERKINS, J.B. 'Severan Art and Architecture at Lepcis Magna', JRS, XXXVIII (1948) 59-80.
- WARD-PERKINS, J.B. 'The Art of the Severan Age in the Light of Tripolitanian Discoveries', PBA, XXXVII (1951) 268-92
- WARD-PERKINS, J.B. 'Excavations in the Severan Basilica at Lepcis Magna', 1951, PBSR, XX (1952) 111-21.
- WARMINGTON, B.H. 'The Municipal Patrons of Roman North Africa', PBSR, IX (1954) 39-55.
- WARMINGTON, B.H. 'The North African Provinces from Diocletian to the Vandal Conquest', Cambridge, 1954.
- WARMINGTON, B.H. 'The Career of Romanus comes Africae', Byz. Zeit., XLIX (1956) 55-64.
- WEIDEMANN, V. 'Eine Bemerkung zu C. Rubellius Blandus, cos. suff. 18, und dessen Vater', Acta Classica, VII (1964) 64-9.
- WELLS, C.M. 'L'Afrique romaine. Roman Africa. Les conférences Vanier 1980. The Vanier Lectures', Ottawa, 1982.
- WESCH-KLEIN, G. 'C. Annius Flavianus. Ergänzungen zu AE, 1980, 959', ZPE, LXXVII (1989) 151-4.
- WIEGELS, R. 'Die römischen Senatoren und Ritter aus den hispanischen Provinzen bis Diokletian. Prosopographie und Herkunft I-III', diss. Freiburg, 1971.
- WILLIAMS, S. 'Diocletian and the Roman Recovery', London, 1985.
- WILKINS, P.I. 'The African Anicii - a Neglected Text and a New Genealogy', Chiron, XVIII (1988) 377-82.
- WILKINS, P.I. 'Amphitheatres and Private Munificence in Roman Africa. A New Text from Thuburnica', ZPE, LXXV (1988) 215-21 and pl. VIIb.
- WISEMAN, T.P. 'The Definition of 'eques romanus' in the Late Republic and Early Empire', Historia, XIX (1970) 67-83.
- WOOD, R., WHEELER, M. 'Roman Africa in Colour', London, 1966.
- ZEVI, F. 'Nuovi documenti epigrafici sugli Egrili Ostiensi', MEFR, LXXXII (1970) 279-320.